

A standard linear barcode is positioned vertically on the left side of the page. It consists of vertical black bars of varying widths on a white background. The barcode is oriented from top to bottom.

3 1761 04709963 5

UNIV OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BINDING LIST SEP 15 1923

PATHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF RELIGIONS

BY
JOSIAH MOSES, PH. D.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Clark University,
Worcester, Mass., in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and accepted on
the recommendation of G. STANLEY HALL

182616.
19.7.23.

Clark University Press
WORCESTER, MASS.
1906

"Take for God's truth that which harmonizes with
all the best you know and helps and strengthens you
in nobility of life."

TENNYSON.

"Error and evil are located in deficiency or excess. Even excess in virtue is evil, an excess of humility being abjectness; of courage, rashness; of prudence, cowardice; of patience, indifference; of economy, parsimony; of generosity, waste; of deference, obsequiousness. And so also an excess of learning is pedantry; of ease, indolence; of comfort, self-indulgence; of zeal, fanaticism. Right and justice are found in moderation, in the golden mean—in the true balance—between overdoing and underdoing, going too fast and too slow."

ORLANDO J. SMITH,
Balance The Fundamental Verity, p. 43.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
INTRODUCTORY NOTE by President G. Stanley Hall,	vii
PREFACE,	1

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITIONS OF RELIGION CLASSIFIED.

Author's definition,	12
Meaning of pathological religion,	12
Criterion for determining what religion is pathological,	14

CHAPTER II.

THE EMOTIONAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

The rôle love plays in religion,	15
Love an efflorescence of the sexual impulse,	15
Examples of the influence of sex on religion,	16
Brinton and others on the relationship between sex and religion,	18
President Hall's parallelisms between love and religion,	20
Phallicism, its origin,	22
Pathological degenerations of phallicism,	25
Renunciation and Restraint, its motives,	30
Hate and anger, their rôles in the religious life,	33
Thugism,	35
Religious suicides,	38
Pity, its rôle in the religious life,	38
The true pedagogy of pity,	40
The Jains and Doukhobors,	41
Fear, an important element in the religious experience,	42
President Hall's study of various fears,	43
Morbid fears,	45
The Great Awakening,	47
The Kentucky Revival,	51
Jumpers,	55
The Conversion of Children,	56
Human Sacrifices,	59
Generalizations,	65

Table of Contents.

	PAGES.
CHAPTER III.	
MYSTICISM.	
Definitions,	69
Mystics criticised,	71
Critics criticised,	72
Mysticism found in all religions,	73
Brahmanism,	74
Sufism,	76
Christian Mysticism,	80
Mysticism among primitive peoples,	123
Analysis of mysticism,	125
CHAPTER IV.	
SYMBOLISM, FETICHISM, AND INTERPRETATION.	
Origin, meaning, and importance of symbolism,	130
Degeneration of symbolism,	132
Sacred relics,	132
Fetichism,	134
Buddhist Praising Wheels,	136
Water and fire baptismal rites,	138
James on ritual worship,	138
Carlyle on pathological symbolism,	139
Symbolism in the Russian Church,	140
Total absence of symbolism is bad,	140
Interpretation and Bibliolatry among the Jews,	141
Extracts from the Talmud,	142
The Qabala,	160
Christianity owes its birth to degeneration of Judaism,	168
Christian bibliolatry and interpretation,	169
CHAPTER V.	
THE INTELLECTUAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.	
Religion not wholly a matter of the intellect,	174
The meaning of belief,	175
Normal and abnormal beliefs differentiated,	176
Beliefs concerning disease,	177
Diseases ascribed to demons,	178
The Church's methods of curing diseases,	179
The Church's hostility to medicine,	180
The Church's medical science, doctrine of signatures, relics, charms, etc.,	181
The Church's hostility to Jewish physicians,	183
Early Protestant beliefs concerning disease,	184

Table of Contents.

V

PAGES.

Warfare waged against inoculation, vaccination, and use of anæsthetics,	185
Persecution of Jews during pestilences,	187
History of beliefs in miracle cures,	188
Christian Science and kindred sects,	189
Normal and abnormal doubt differentiated,	193
Four types of doubters,	194
Renan's and James's 'Will to Believe,'	201
Work, a cure for doubt,	203
Doubting, an adolescent phenomenon,	204
Evils of bad religious training,	205
Scientism and apathy,	207
Attitude of atheist, scientist, and apathist toward religion,	208

CHAPTER VI.

THE VOLITIONAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

The rôle that will plays in the religious experience,	213
Fanaticism analyzed and described,	215
Value of uniformity in religious observances,	221
John Calvin, his character and work,	222
Church organizations, their origin and development,	226
Distinction between individual and institutional religions,	227
Importance of institutional religion,	231
Asceticism and monasticism,	233
Four types of 'other-worldists,'	234
Active and passive asceticism,	235
Origins of asceticism, and resultant attitudes towards life,	238
Selfishness and inhumanity of ascetics,	241
Sketch of St. Macarius of Alexandria,	245
Sketch of St. Simeon of Stylites,	246
Sketch of St. Theodosius,	247
Sketch of St. Stephen of Grandmont,	248
Sketch of St. Peter Damiani,	249
The Flagellants,	253
False ascetics,	255
Monasteries become hotbeds of vice,	256
Only abnormal religious experiences have been catalogued and studied,	259
Index,	261

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

With this memoir Clark University begins the publication of monograph supplements to its most recently established Journal.

This thesis of Dr. Moses marks one of the very earliest attempts to treat of the abnormal side of religious life. While it is generally admitted that religious experience may become pathological, no one has attempted before to trace perversions, excesses and aberrations over so wide a field. Hence, this treatise merits special leniency on the part of the reader, which pioneer work can always justly claim. It is often hard to draw a clear line of demarkation between the normal and the abnormal, and in doing this no doubt individual judgments would differ. None of the topics are treated exhaustively, but the effort throughout has been to do suggestive work with the conviction that this domain is almost sure to be far more cultivated later. The writer has spent much time for three years upon his theme, has written and rewritten nearly every page and believes that were he to continue his work for a decade or two his conclusions would continue to undergo transformation.

It is a very important lesson for our times and one that should impress itself upon every one interested in the phenomena of religious life that it is not exempt from disease any more than is every tissue and organ of the body. It hardly need be added that what is herein contained involves no disparagement of true religion and ought to be heartily welcomed by every one who desires to see it kept pure and undefiled.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that wide as is the field here covered, there are many other topics that might very properly be included under its title that are not here touched upon.

G. STANLEY HALL.

Clark University,
September, 1906.

PREFACE.

Pathological aspects of religions ! The very title is sufficient to produce a variety of reactions in the different individuals who will read or hear it, and, as in the case of so many other titles and phrases, we may expect it soon to be roundly abused by all parties. Those atheistically inclined will perhaps hail it with delight, and apply it indiscriminately to everything in all religions ; the religious will recoil from it, but those who belong to no sect or party, and who are therefore unprejudiced, will draw no hasty conclusions, but will calmly seek for its true scope and meaning, and, we hope, be rewarded in some measure for their pains. Certainly the last is the only proper attitude to assume in the study of this subject, as it is in all others.

The mine, here opened up with crude implements, is not altogether a new one. At least two other pioneers have dug in it and brought forth much valuable ore. One of these was M. Ernest Murisier, a young French *savant* whose early death was a great loss to the scientific world. His work¹ is a little masterpiece of psychological analysis, but its scope is limited to three chapters: *Mysticism*, *Fanaticism*, and *Emotional Contagion*. The other is Prof. Wm. James, whose more ambitious production² is already familiar to every one. The value of his labor is unfortunately minimized because he considered all his curious specimens pure ore and failed to see that the majority of them contained much dross and but little of the pure metal. Had he named his work “*Varieties of Abnormal Religious Experience*,” and studied his materials from that point of view, it would have been undoubtedly the best so far produced on the subject. As it is, the work is confusing, distorted and objectionable to a large class of readers who prefer to consider many if not most of the experiences he has collected and analyzed distinctly pathological rather than mere exaggerations of normal religious experiences.

¹ *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieux*, Paris, 1901.

² *Varieties of Religious Experience*.

There is an important difference between disease and excessive strength or weakness.

Besides these two there have been many alienists who have noted religious aberrations of various sorts among their patients, and anthropologists who have carefully described scattered cases of pathological religious beliefs, rites, ceremonies, customs, etc., among primitive, ancient, and modern peoples, but no attempt has been made to collect, analyze, and classify these cases psychologically.

The present study modestly undertakes to do this. Its author has drawn all his materials, and many of his explanations from the works of alienists, anthropologists, missionaries, historians, and biographers; has studied these as impartially and classified them as best he could. He makes no claim to originality, except perhaps in method of treatment, and is conscious of its very many lacunæ and deficiencies. He has only sorted the crude ore, leaving to more expert hands to do the smelting and refining.

The work is intended to parallel and complement in some measure the labors of Leuba, Starbuck, Coe, and others who have done so much to tell us the true psychological meaning of many of the normal religious experiences. For while dealing altogether with pathological religious experiences it throws considerable light indirectly upon those normal experiences of which they are the degenerations, and furnishes us a better and more complete picture of the birth, development, and decay of religion in the race and in the individual than the former could alone. It is also hoped that this study will be of service to religious pedagogues, in that it endeavors to mark with buoys the hidden rocks and reefs on which so many religious ships in the past have foundered.

In no department of education are the need and importance of sound pedagogical principles so great as in religion, for no other has a subject which touches deeply so many sides and interests of human life. Religion is perhaps the oldest product of human feeling and thought, so old at any rate that many consider it one of the fundamental instincts. Its influence on the evolution of the race and on the life of the individual is simply incalculable, and therefore any error made in the inculcation of its principles is fraught with untold consequences. One poorly trained in mathematics, physics, languages, etc., is not nearly so dangerous a member of society as one poorly trained in religion, for the former

are recent, accessory acquirements which do not begin to shape the character and conduct of the individual to the degree and extent that the latter does. A study of this sort should therefore be full of suggestions to those to whom the religious training of the young is intrusted. Its aim throughout is not to destroy but to fulfill, and the thought so well expressed by Dean Farrar has been constantly in the mind of its author : “ We study the past not to denounce it, not to set ourselves above it, not to dissever ourselves from its continuity, but to learn from it, and to avoid its failures. It has much to teach us by way of solemn warning. If we shall have to dwell upon its mistakes it is only that we may have grace to avoid them, and to be on our guard against similar tendencies.”¹

It is the opinion of the writer that the future will not be non-religious, as an ever-increasing number of scholars predict it will, but will possess a religion which will appropriate and assimilate the good of all the religions of the past and present, and will harmonize with its stage of development and satisfy the peculiar needs which only a religion of some sort can satisfy. It is already a platitude that each age has the religion which it deserves, but during transition periods it happens that progress is made along some lines much more rapidly than along others, and the difficulty of making proper adjustments is so great that impatient spirits grow restless and strive to force the adjustment even if they have to eliminate one or two important factors entirely. If old religion and the new science cannot immediately come to terms the enthusiastic but short-sighted partisans of the latter are ready to sacrifice the former, while the religious enthusiasts are equally eager to disparage and even annihilate all science. Fortunately, these individuals are few and their power relatively small. The race moves slowly and cautiously, regardless of the goading of the few, and instinctively refuses to lose anything that may be of value to it.

That of all things it will not leave Religion, the grandest legacy of the ages, behind, no one who is conversant with Volk-psychology and the trend of the present age will deny. Science is already halting in its mad and disappointing rush, and beginning to suspect that the promised land it was so eagerly “ making for ” is but a mirage or the phantom of an overwrought brain. Philosophy is bending all her energies

¹ Hist. of Interpretation, p. 14.

to reconcile Science and Religion, knowing that the alliance will be extremely beneficial to both, in that it will save them from pessimism, despair, and deterioration.

Clifford's Cosmic Consciousness, the Panpsychism of Fechner, Stout, Strong, and others, the Pure Experiences of James, the new Humanism of Schiller, and the Pragmatism of the Chicago School, are all efforts, I take it, to bring about this reconciliation; that is, they are tendencies away from materialism and the crude conception of law which were the offspring of an immature science toward a new idealism which is always the closest ally of religion.

It is, perhaps, another instance of the irony of fate that Science should wittingly or unwittingly become Religion's greatest benefactor. She has pruned the religious tree of all its dead and superfluous twigs and branches, has cleaned it of its many deathly parasites, so that now it is much more beautiful and healthy than it ever was, and the future may well hope to enjoy fruits, richer and more luscious than were ever possessed by the past.

I gladly take this opportunity to acknowledge my very great indebtedness to President G. Stanley Hall, who first suggested the subject to me, and without whose continued help, encouragement, and inspiration, this study, crude and imperfect as it is, could not have been completed.

J. M.

WORCESTER, MASS., July, 1905.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITIONS OF RELIGION.

It is evident that just as in medicine, psychiatry, art and ethics, we must know physical and mental health, beauty, and goodness, in order to clearly understand disease, ugliness, and evil; so too, in religion, a knowledge of its healthy normal condition, is a prerequisite to a knowledge of its abnormal, pathological condition. The one is as important as the other, and both must be kept constantly in countenance of each other, in order that each may shed light upon the other. In order, therefore, to determine what pathological religion is we must first determine what normal religion is.

What is religion? The history of the attempts that have been made to answer this question forms a long and tedious chapter in the history of human thought. Almost every writer on the subject, from the earliest times down to the present, has offered a different definition, no one being quite content with those offered by the others. The old adage, "Quot homines tot sententiae" holds nowhere more true than here. A collection and classification of some of these definitions may not be without interest.

1. A great many writers, both ancient and modern, have, as Prof. Brinton points out,¹ looked upon the religious state, "*in se*" as pathological, "a symptom of a diseased brain." Thus, Empedocles in the fifth century B. C., declared it to be "a sickness of the mind," and Feuerbach, about fifty years ago, stigmatized it as "the most pernicious malady of humanity." Prof. Sergi, in his recent book, *L'Origine dei Fenomeni Psichici*,² says point blank that all religions, the highest as well as the lowest, are pathological. They all spring from desire for protection against evils, present and future, and inasmuch as the protection is foolishly sought from supernatural, and therefore unnatural sources which never existed, the desire cannot be satisfied, and therefore, all forms of prayer, worship, sacrifices, in short, all religious

¹ Religions of Primitive Peoples, p. 41 ff.

² Ch. 15, pp. 264-298.

beliefs and practices are a waste of time, productive of fatalism, and harmful to progress. Religion, he hopes, will in the future be supplanted by science, which will offer natural explanations of the causes of all the ills to which humanity is subject, and furnish natural remedies for them.

2. A similar view, quite prevalent in all ages, is that religion is superstition. Hobbes defines it somewhere as "superstition sanctioned by the State" and tells us that it was born of fear and ignorance. Lucretius declared it was born of a dream, while Guyau and other contemporaries tell us that it is at best only a product of the childhood of the race, which we will soon outgrow.

3. A third view is that religion is a fraud invented by priests and rulers to frighten the masses into subjection. This was a favorite view about the time of the French Revolution. In England, Shelley championed this view and declared it to be one of his missions "to unveil the religious frauds by which nations have been deluded into submission." These three groups of theories and definitions may be characterized as antagonistic definitions; definitions not of religion, but against religion. They are the favorites of atheists.

4. Still another view holds that at some far-distant time the Creator revealed himself to our forebears thereby causing Religion to be born full-grown in their souls. Present religions are mere reminiscences and degenerations of that perfect religion which was the parent of them all. Religion has not, like language, art, science, government, etc., developed according to the laws of evolution; her's was a Minerva-like birth.

Closely akin to this view is that which holds that religion is an expression of the 'inner light' that 'light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world' disclosing unto him the existence of God and the fact of his soul. "When I say that all religions depend for their origin and continuance directly upon inspiration," writes Dr. Brinton, "I state an historic fact. It may be known under other names, of credit or discredit, as mysticism, ecstasy, rhapsody, demoniac possession, the divine afflatus, the gnosis, or in its latest christening, 'cosmic consciousness.' All are but expressions of a belief that knowledge arises, words are uttered or actions performed not through *conscious ideation* or reflective purpose but through the promptings of a power above or beyond the individual mind."¹ It is interesting to note in passing, Dr.

¹ *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 52 ff.

Brinton's earlier view of the matter. "Religions," this author tells us in another work, "are the *unaided attempts* of man to find out God; they are the efforts of the reason struggling to define the infinite; they are the expressions of that 'yearning after the gods' which the earliest of poets discerned in the hearts of all men."¹

Again, there are the views of narrow-minded sectarians who hold that the only religion worthy of the name is their own; all others are base superstitions and idolatries. This view has received its best expression in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and is not uncommon even to-day.

Prof. Leuba, in one of his excellent articles,² has collected a number of scientific and philosophical definitions, and classified them into three groups as follows:

In the first group, which may be called the Noetic group, "a specific intellectual element is given as the essence, or as the distinguishing mark of religion."

Thus, Martineau defines religion as, "a belief in an Ever-living God, that is, in a Divine mind and will ruling the universe and holding moral relations with mankind."

Romanes: "Religion is a department of thought having for its objects a self-conscious and intelligent Being."

d'Alviella: Religion is, "The belief in the existence of superhuman beings who interfere in a mysterious fashion in the destiny of man."

Hegel: Religion is, "The knowledge possessed by the finite mind of its nature as absolute mind."

In the second, or Feeling and *Æsthetic* group, "it is one or several specific feelings which are singled out as the religious *differentiae*."

Schleiermacher: "Religion cannot and will not originate in the pure impulse to know. It is neither thinking nor acting, but intuition and feeling." Later he wrote: "Religion is a feeling of absolute dependence."

Herbart: "Sympathy with the universal dependence of men is the essential natural principle of all religion."

Goethe, in *Faust*:

"Nenn's Glück! Herz! Liebe! Gott!
Ich habe keinen Namen
Dafür, Gefühl ist alles."

¹ The Myths of the New World, p. 15.

² Intro. to a Psychological Study of Religion, *Monist*, Jan., 1901. The reader will find here a good collection and criticism of definitions.

Sabatier: "That which we call religion in a man is the sentiment of the relation in which he stands and wants to stand to the universal principle upon which he knows himself to be dependent, and to the universe itself of which he finds himself a part." . . . A filial feeling towards God and a fraternal feeling towards man is what makes the Christian."

Upton: "It is the felt relationship in which the finite self-consciousness stands to the immanent and universal ground of all being, which constitutes religion."

In the third, or Volitional and Ethical group, "the active principle, the cravings, the desires, the impulses, the will, take the place occupied by the intellect or the feelings in the other classes."

Bradley: "Religion is the attempt to express the complete reality of goodness through every aspect of our being."

Feuerbach: "The origin, nay, the essence of religion is desire: if man possessed no needs, no desires, he would possess no gods."

Marshall: "The restraint of individualistic impulses to racial ones (the suppression of our will to a higher will) seems to me to be of the very essence of religion; the belief in the Deity, as usually found, being from the psychological point of view an attachment to, rather than the essence of, the religious feeling."

The Golden Rule, found in so many of the ancient religions may be cited here as emphasizing this element to the exclusion almost, of all the others. When a Gentile came to Rabbi Hillel with the challenge, "Proselytize me, but on condition that thou teach me the whole law whilst I stand upon one leg," the latter converted him by replying, "That which is hateful to thyself, do not do to thy neighbor. This is the whole law, all the rest is its commentary." Similarly, the Apostle James: "What doth it profit though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" Right willing and acting, rather than mere believing, is for him the essence of religion.

That these definitions are all more or less one-sided, need hardly be pointed out. Each one as we should expect, finds in religion that which is predominant in his own soul. Goethe could not have possibly been true to himself and said anything else than, "Name it what you will, for me it is all feeling." Spencer, Romanes, and other investigators were, by their natures, compelled to define it in terms of the intel-

lect, and likewise the men of action like James and Bondaref were compelled to define it in terms of will and conduct. Such definitions are valuable more for the light they shed on individual psychology, than for their aid in the solution of the question 'What is religion?' The other writers whom we have quoted, deluded by the fatal faculty-psychology, endeavored, either by analyzing and comparing the different historical religions, to arrive at the origin, the seed from which they all sprang, or, by eliminating all that is characteristic of the different species to discover the one quality or essence common to all; a 'sumnum genus' from which, as a starting point, they might construct a religious tree à la Haeckel.

All the various theories concerning the origin of religion are nothing more than mere idle guesses in the dark. Its roots lie so deeply and intricately imbedded and enmeshed in the past of the race that it has now become almost an instinct, which, in its proper time, and under normal conditions, sprouts forth spontaneously from the dark and impenetrable regions of the individual's sub-consciousness. To say that religion was born of the emotions, or the intellect, or the will is to arbitrarily partition the soul into three air-tight compartments, a procedure which flagrantly violates the truth and for which there is absolutely no justification. The soul is an organic unity of inseparable parts, which develop, ripen, and decay concomitantly and covariantly. When in its gradual evolution it finally reached the mature chrysalis state and was beginning to emerge into a beautiful butterfly, *i. e.*, when our simian ancestors were becoming more human than ape, then many wonderful changes must have taken place and new conditions pregnant with future possibilities were born. It was then that the veil was lifted from the eyes of our ancestors; they beheld the wonders and mysteries of the starry heavens, and the forces of nature playing about them; they caught a glimpse of God, were filled with wonder, admiration, awe, curiosity, and fear; the bud unfolded itself, and the beautiful flower, religion, was born in the world. This, figurative and fanciful as it is, is probably the most that can be said concerning its birth. The Dutch botanist, Hugo de Vries, maintains that new types can arise suddenly. Great variations, not small, as Darwin thought, are, according to him, the condition of evolution through the struggle for life. If religion be the product of some such

sudden mental variation, the futility of trying to trace it back to an instinct, or feeling, or will-act, would be all the more manifest.

Of the essence of religion we can likewise make no dogmatic statement. There are no two religions, we venture to say, whose essences are precisely the same. Indeed, we may go even further and say that as many men, so many religions. We should more accurately speak of religions than of religion which exists only as an abstract term or idea. The attempt to reduce all religions to one common denominator is as futile as that of the ancient School of Miletus, to find in water, the infinite atmosphere, breath, the first and fundamental principle of the whole universe.

Instead of vainly endeavoring to discover the origin or essence of religion, several recent writers have wisely undertaken to ascertain the psychological meaning and value of the religions which the different peoples, primitive, barbarous, and civilized, now possess and the influence they exert upon their lives. Here we may mention among others, the following definitions :

Eliza Ritchie : "When we speak of a religious man or race, we have in view a certain temper of mind, a certain way of conceiving the facts of existence, a doctrine of some sort. But we also know that a doctrine itself, however elaborate it may be, does not constitute a religion. When the doctrine affects the tone and color of the individual's emotional life, and has a determining influence upon his conduct, then the individual may be said to be religious. Whether the creed be low or lofty, simple or complex, it must be *felt*; whether its outer expression consist in ceremony or ritual, moral precepts or ethical principles, philanthropic work or fanatical persecutions, some effect it must have on the emotional and practical life; if either of these factors be wholly absent, the phenomenon is not that of religion."¹

Pfeiderer : "In the religious consciousness all sides of the whole personality participate. Of course we must recognize that knowing and willing are here, not ends in themselves, as in science and morality, but rather subordinated to feeling as the real centre of religious consciousness. This is not simply a feeling, but a combination of feelings of freedom and dependence."

¹The Essentials of Religion, Phil. Rev., Jan., 1901.

Caird: "Without as yet attempting to define religion, we may go as far as to say that a man's religion is the expression of his ultimate attitude to the Universe, the summed-up meaning and purport of his whole consciousness of things."

Tolstoi: "True religion is a relation, accordant with reason and knowledge, which man establishes with the infinite life surrounding him, and it is such as binds his life to that infinity, and guides his conduct."¹

James: "Religion means, for the purpose of these lectures, the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine."²

The phrase, "in their solitude," limits the definition to the passive, subjective type of individuals, such as the mystics, monastics, and ascetics, and eliminates that much larger class of individuals in whom the religious fervor is at its highest pitch only when they are in a group or crowd, when they are laboring for their unfortunate fellow-beings, for the general welfare of the race; or, if fanatics, when they are warring against heretics and the enemies of their God.

As definitions, it is not difficult to raise objections against each of the above, but the point which they emphasize, namely, that religion is an experience which is the combined effect of all the activities of the psyche,—beliefs, emotional responses, and volitional acts of various kinds,—and which shapes in large measure the lives and conduct of men, evinces a deeper and broader knowledge of the true nature of religion and its relation to life than any of the previous ones.

Owing to its fullness, comprehensiveness, and extreme complexity, we shall never, perhaps, have a perfectly adequate and satisfactory definition of religion, and it is doubtful whether such a definition is at all necessary. A summation of all the definitions that have ever been offered, and those that will be offered in the future, would approach nearer the truth than any particular one, for as has already been stated, religion is not an abstract something which exists somewhere in the realm of space, but is a concrete experience which every individual has in a greater or less degree, and in no two are they precisely the same.

¹ Essays and Letters, p. 295.

² Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 31.

It should be plain, therefore, that the following is not offered as a standard definition of religion, but as the writer's attempt to state as briefly and concisely as possible his own conception of the meaning of the term in the hope that it will better enable the reader to follow him and understand his view-point and conclusions.

Religion is a whole-souled or rather a psycho-physical reaction to one or more preternatural objects or beings, or to ideals which are believed to be somehow constantly and seriously related to the individual and the race. We employ the term preternatural rather than supernatural because the latter does not accurately describe the conceptions and beliefs of primitive and barbarous peoples concerning their gods and idols. They were not exactly natural, nor yet, properly speaking, supernatural. They were something other than natural, as nature was then understood, *i. e.*, preternatural.

Now that we have stated as best we can what we mean by normal religion, we can more readily explain what we mean by pathological religion. In an off-hand fashion, it may be said, that religious experience which is not a well-rounded, well-balanced reaction of the whole soul is pathological, but in saying this it must be remembered that not all people react with the same fullness of force, nor in the same way. There are all stages of religious development in the individual as well as in the race, and the reaction which is normal to one stage of development is different from that which is normal to another. Indeed, what is normal for one may be pathological for the other. We cannot, therefore, have a hard and fixed standard of measurement for all religions, but must employ a different standard for each religion. The child and savage cannot be expected to have as lofty and abstract religious conceptions as have the Buddhists, for example, or the modern Christians, but they are justly expected to have the religious conceptions and experiences which are normal to their stage of development; anything short of that is an evidence of arrested development or degeneration. In the field of morals we are told that the individual should act in accordance with the idea of his kind or his type,¹ and the same rule applies to religion as well. In judging, therefore, of an individual's or race's religious normality, we must compare them not with individuals belonging to another race,

¹ See Alexander: *Moral Order and Progress*, p. 236; Leslie Stephen, *Science of Ethics*, p. 397.

but with those of their own, with their ancestors and neighbors who grew up with them in the same environment and under similar conditions. And within this compass we shall meet with all degrees of growth and decay; *i. e.*, among Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, etc., there are sects and denominations who hold religious views and perform religious rites which are abnormal to the stage of development of their respective religions.

Unfortunately, however, our knowledge of the life-history of the different tribes and races, especially the primitive ones; the conditions of their social, intellectual, and natural environments, is in many cases too fragmentary and uncertain to enable us to determine whether their religious development has kept pace with their moral, social, and intellectual development, or whether it has been arrested, or degenerated. Of the religions of certain peoples who are our neighbors and contemporaries, such for instance, as the Holy Orthodox Greek Church of Russia, with its numerous sects and fifteen millions of schismatics, and in our own country the Christian Catholic Church, or Dowieism, Christian Scientists, the Society of the Holy Ghost and Us, and many others, there is certain and almost complete knowledge, and therefore, we have no hesitancy in stigmatizing them as more or less pathological. Of the religions of many primitive peoples, however, we can make no such definite statement. It is difficult to understand the people and get into sympathetic rapport with their religions, and besides our knowledge of them is largely derived from the reports of tourists and missionaries, whose observations were unscientific, to say the least. There is one criterion, however, of which we are sure, namely, the effects of the religions upon their adherents. Religion, like government, is of, for, and by the people, and like government, it is of positive value only when it serves the needs of the people, makes life more moral and joyful, and aids them in their normal development. But just as there are autocratic and tyrannical forms of government which militate against the mental and material welfare and progress of their subjects, so too, are there religions, which, instead of being subservient to their votaries, have terrorized and enslaved them, inoculated them with the virus of pessimism, made death a boon, and hindered their normal development in countless different ways. Such religions cannot but be considered pathological.

“Insanity,” writes E. Stanley Abbot, “is a morbid condition of the mind which renders it impossible for the conscious individual to think, feel, or act, *in relation to his environment, in accordance with the standards of his bringing up*,”¹ and Dr. Brinton, speaking of racial insanity, says: “A pathological condition of the ethnic mind is present when it is chronically incapable of directing the activities of the group correctly toward self-preservation and development.”² Basing our criterion on these facts we shall hold that whenever the religious experiences or practices *injure* the psychical or physical condition of the individual or group, or retard their growth so that they cannot think, act, or feel in relation to their environments, in accordance with the standards normal to their stages of development, they are positively pathological.

With this criterion constantly in mind, and remembering that the religious state is a *combined effect* of many, if not all psychic experiences and activities, and not a *compound* composed of separable units, we shall analyze some of the religions of primitive, ancient, mediæval, and modern peoples into their emotional, intellectual, and volitional elements, for the same reason that psychologists analyze consciousness into sensation, perception, conception, memory, imagination, emotion, will, reasoning, association, etc., and endeavor to show that an excessive exaggeration or elimination of any one of the elements produces a disharmonious relationship between them, so to speak, and leads to degeneration of the whole state.

¹ Am. Jour. Insanity, July, 1902.

² The Basis of Social Relations, p. 84.

CHAPTER II.

THE EMOTIONAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

LOVE.

That love plays a large and most important rôle in the religious experiences of men, will readily be admitted by every one, but that love itself is an irradiation, an efflorescence of the sexual impulse which is as old as life and is the very foundation of life, some few, perhaps, will be inclined to doubt. Biologists, anthropologists, and alienists, however, are unanimous on this point, and philology renders the same verdict. The English word, 'love,' the German, 'lieben,' the Danish, 'lieven,' Russian, 'lioblyu,' and Latin, 'lubeo,' are all derived from the Sanscrit root word, 'loab,' which means desire, lust, passion. And the same is true of the Hebrew word for love. That the instinct which attracts the sexes for the purpose of re-creation is the root from which all love has grown is an established fact of science, and now that we understand better and more truly the meaning of evolution, of sexual selection and reproduction in the plant and animal series, we realize the absurdity of being ashamed of the percentage of our noblest emotion.

This fact is of special interest to us because of the light it throws on the dynamic relationship between religion and sex which appears so frequently in the insane, and in the biographies and autobiographies of Saints, both male and female, of monks and nuns, and religious enthusiasts in general. Here we find that religion and sex are inextricably interwoven, so to speak, and influence each other at every turn. Sexual disturbances irradiate and produce marked religious disturbances such as erotic religious trances, visions, hallucinations, mystic experiences, etc., and religious disturbances such as take place at excited revivals and religious gatherings, frequently give rise to sexual excesses of the most revolting nature. Unable to express itself naturally, the sexual impulse finds an outlet in a more or less sensuous love of God, Christ, or the Virgin Mary; and likewise the religious

impulse when overwrought, breaks through its natural bounds and spends itself in sexual orgies. In the religious ceremonies of the Christs, for example, a peculiar mystical sect in Russia, after the performance of a series of hysterical acts, such as rapid whirling around on their heels, loud singing and stamping, wild and uncontrolled laughing, yelling, contortioning, mutual flagellation, tearing off their clothes, running wildly, throwing themselves on the ground, walking on all fours, sitting on each others' backs, etc., which continue late in the night, they throw themselves pell mell, men and women, on beds, benches, on the ground, and abandon themselves to indescribable forms of depravity. "The carnal love which we experience for our sisters," they say, in justification of their licentiousness, "is sanctified by the presence of the Holy Spirit among us." Even more degrading are the closing scenes of the ceremonies of another kindred Russian sect, the Skoptsy.¹ Similar phenomena obtained in the festival of Venus, the Bacchanalia, Florolia, Saturnalia, Liberalia, and others, not only of the early Greeks and Romans, but also of the European nations until almost recent times.

Of the influence of sex on religion there are also very many examples. Mme. Guyon, whose married life was loveless and most unhappy, cried, "I wish the Divine love, the love which chills the soul with ineffable shivers, the love which puts me in a swoon." And later, when she had experienced the mystic union with God, she wrote, "O! my God, if you should make the most sensual persons feel what I feel, they would soon leave their false pleasures to enjoy one so true." Another mystic, Ruysbroeck, sought and found in God an enjoyment, "more voluptuous for the body and soul than all other earthly pleasures." Numerous other erotic mystics, especially the female ones, such as St. Teresa, Catherine of Sienna, and St. Gertrude, who experienced mystical "marriages with God," express themselves in similar strains. Of the first, James says, "In the main, her idea of religion seems to have been that of an endless amatory flirtation—if one may say so without irreverence—between the devotee and the Deity."² And of the last we read, that one day, "Suffering from a headache, she sought, for the glory of God, to relieve herself by holding certain odoriferous substances in her mouth, when the Lord appeared to her to lean over

¹ See N. Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire*, pp. 63-97. Paris, 1888.
² James: *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 347.

towards her lovingly, and to find comfort Himself in these odors. After having gently breathed them in, He arose, and said with a gratified air to the Saints, as if contented with what He had done: 'See the new present which my betrothed has given Me!'

"One day, at chapel, she heard supernaturally sung, the words, '*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,*' The Son of God leaning towards her like a sweet lover, and giving to her soul the softest kiss, said to her at the second Sanctus: 'In this *Sanctus* addressed to my person, receive with this kiss all the sanctity of my divinity and of my humanity, and let it be to thee a sufficient preparation for the approaching communion table.' And the next following Sunday, while she was thanking God for this favor, behold the Son of God, more beauteous than thousands of angels, takes her in His arms as if He were proud of her, and presents her to God, the Father, in that perfection of sanctity with which He had dowered her. And the Father took such delight in this soul thus presented by His only Son, that, as if unable longer to restrain Himself, He gave her, and the Holy Ghost gave her also, the sanctity attributed to each by His own *Sanctus*, and thus she remained endowed with the plenary fullness of the blessing of *Sanctity*, bestowed on her by Omnipotence, by Wisdom, and by Love."²

Francis Parkman states that the nuns sent over to America in colonization days were frequently seized with religio-sexual frenzy. "She heard," he writes of Marie de l'Incarnation, "in a trance, a miraculous voice. It was that of Christ, promising to become her spouse. Months and years passed, full of troubled hopes and fears, when again the voice sounded in her ear, with assurance that the promise was fulfilled, and that she was indeed his bride. Now, ensued phenomena which are not infrequent among Roman Catholic female devotees when married, or married unhappily, and which have their source in the necessities of a woman's nature. To her excited thought, her divine spouse became a living presence; and her language to him, as recorded by herself, is of intense passion. She went to prayer, agitated and tremulous, as if to a meeting with an earthly lover. 'Oh my Love!' she exclaimed, 'when shall I embrace you? Have you no pity on the torments that I suffer? Alas! alas! my Love! my

² *Revelations de Sainte Gertrude*, Paris, 1898, i. 44, 186. Quoted by James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 345-6.

Beauty! my Life! Instead of healing my pain you take pleasure in it. Come let me embrace you; and die in your sacred arms!''¹

This vital, interdependent relationship between the two impulses is so marked that, with perhaps only one exception, Prof. Wm. James,² all who have given the matter serious thought have been forcibly impressed by it. Havelock Ellis writes: "The intimate association between the emotions of love and religion is well known to all those who are habitually brought into close contact with the phenomena of the religious life. Love and religion are the two most volcanic emotions to which the human organism is liable, and it is not surprising that when there is a disturbance in one of these spheres the vibrations should readily extend to the other. Nor is it surprising that the two emotions should have a dynamic relation to each other, and that the auto-erotic impulse being the more primitive and fundamental of the two impulses should be able to pass its unexpended energy over to the religious emotion, there to find the expansion hitherto denied it, the love of the human becoming the love of the divine."³

Brinton sees in love one of the most important roots of religion. "The sentiment which attracts one sex to another, the passion of Love, exceeds all others in the power it exerts on the individual life. This it is, which in some of its forms, rude or refined, is at the root of half the expressions of the religious sentiment. We may trace it from crude and coarse beginnings in the genesiac cults of primitive peoples, through ever nobler and more delicate expressions, up through the celibate sacrifices of both sexes; spouses of God, until in its complete expansion it reaches the perfect agape, where the union of the human with the divine in the life eternal, here on earth, or beyond, one and the same, is believed to have been reached."⁴ "The religious passion," writes Baring Gould, "verges so closely on the sexual passion that a slight additional pressure given to it bursts the partition, and both are confused in a frenzy of religious debauch."⁵ Jennings:⁶ "It may be at once boldly asserted as a truth that there is not

¹ The Jesuits in North America, p. 175.

² Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 11 footnote.

³ Psych. of Sex, Vol. 2, Appendix C.

⁴ Rel. of Prim. Peoples, p. 170.

⁵ Freaks of Fanaticism, p. 268.

⁶ Phallicism.

a religion that does not spring from the sexual distinctions. Religion is to be found alone with its justification and explanation in the relation between the sexes.''¹ Wier,¹ Howard,² Forlong,³ Westropp,⁴ and many others express themselves in a similar strain. These writers, however, are extremists and their theories like all other exclusive theories fall before comprehensive criticism. All that we can probably say with any justice, is that sexual desire or love, is one, but only one, of the oldest sources of the religious sentiment.

Coming to the alienists we find them in unison in maintaining that the closest relationship exists between the reproductive instinct and religion. Schroeder van der Kalk writes: "I venture to express my conviction that we should rarely err, if in a case of religious melancholy we assumed the sexual apparatus to be implicated." Esquirol, Friedreich, Regis, Berthier, Conolly Norman, Ball, Brouardel, Morselli, C. H. Hughes, Vallon and Marie, Krafft-Ebing, and Jos. Workman, all concur with Van der Kalk on this point. Krafft-Ebing: "It suffices to recall how intense sexuality makes itself manifest in the clinical history of many religious maniacs; the motley mixture of religious and sexual delusions that is so frequently observed in psychoses (*e. g.* in maniacal women who think they are or will be the mother of God), but particularly in masturbatic insanity, and finally the sexual, cruel self-punishment, injuries, self-castrations, and even self-crucifixions resulting from abnormal religio-sexual feeling."⁵ Spitzka: "All through the history of insanity the student has occasion to observe this close alliance of sexual and religious ideas; an alliance which may be partly accounted for because of the prominence which sexual themes have in most creeds, as illustrated in ancient times by the phallus worship of the Egyptians; the ceremonies of the Friga Cultus of the Saxons; the frequent and detailed reference to sexual topics in the Koran and several other books of the kind, and which is further illustrated in the performances which, to come down to a modern period, characterize the religious revival and camp-meeting, as they tinctured their medieval model, the Münster Anabaptist movement."⁶

¹ Religion and Lust, Louisville, Ky., 1897.

² Sex Worship, Washington, D. C., 1897.

³ Rivers of Life, London.

⁴ Primitive Symbolism, London, 1885.

⁵ Psychopathia Sexualis, p. 8.

⁶ Insanity, p. 39.

Again, it has been abundantly shown by Profs. Starbuck, Leuba, Coe, Lancaster, and others, that the earliest and most important religious crisis, conversion, is essentially a phenomenon of adolescence and therefore synchronous with the development of sexual life. "Beyond a question of doubt," writes Wier, "man becomes religiously enthused most frequently either early in life when pubescence is, or is about to be established, or late in life when sexual desire has become either entirely extinct or very much abated." Likewise President Hall: "It is no accidental synchronism of unrelated events that the age of religion and that of sexual maturity coincide, any more than that senescence has its own type of religiosity. Nor is religion degraded by the recognition of this intimate relationship, save to those who either think vilely of sex or who lack insight into its real psychic nature and so fail to realize how indissoluble is the bond that God and nature have wrought between religion and love. Perhaps Plato is right, and love of the good, beautiful, and true is only love of sex transfigured and transcendentalized; but the Gospel is better, which makes sex love at the best the type and symbol of love of God and man."¹ The words and phrases used as synonyms of conversion, such as '*regeneration*,' '*the new life*,' etc., are also suggestive.

It is further a well known fact that adolescent insanity is to a large extent due to disorders of the reproductive function, and that in many cases the insanity expresses itself in some form of religious exaltation. To quote from Wier again, "Of all insanities of the pubescent state, erotomania and religious mania are the most frequent and the most pronounced. Sometimes they go hand in hand, the most inordinate sensuality being coupled with abnormal religious zeal."² Very interesting and suggestive in this connection are the many parallelisms between love and religion which President Hall, in the monumental work from which we have just quoted, has found and enumerated. We abbreviate the principal ones.³

1. The attitude of the lover and religionist towards death is the same. The fanatic rushes into the very jaws of death to avenge an insult to his God; the ardent lover does as

¹ *Adolescence*, Vol. 2, pp. 292-293. The reader will here find the briefest and yet most comprehensive treatment of the psychology of conversion that exists in any language.

² *Religion and Lust*, p. 94.

³ *Adolescence*, Vol. 2, pp. 295-301.

much for his offended lady love. The mystic yearns for death that he may become one with God ; the lover that he may become "the air that surrounds, the breeze that fans, or the ornament that adorns his beloved."

2. The soul in both is highly sensitive to nature. Both love and religion draw the curtains from the eyes of their votaries and show them beauties in nature to which they were previously blind. Jonathan Edwards, the God-intoxicated man of America, tells us that after his conversion, "the appearance of everything altered ; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast or appearance of divine glory in almost everything, God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity, and love seemed to appear in everything, — in the sun, moon, and stars; in clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water and all nature, which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for continuance, and in the day spent much time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things; in the meantime singing forth, with a low voice, my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer. . . . Before, I used to be uncommonly terrified with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder storm arising; but now, on the contrary, it rejoiced me. I felt God, so to speak, at the first appearance of a thunderstorm, and used to take the opportunity, at such times, to fix myself in order to view the clouds and see the lightnings play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder, which oftentimes was exceedingly entertaining, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great and glorious God."

For the amorist, too, do the sun, moon, and stars, the clouds and blue sky, the flowers, grass, and trees, the winds and streams take on a new aspect and meaning, but to him they suggest not so much the glory of God as the rare beauty and sweet qualities of his Dulcinea.

3. Love builds and decorates its nests and homes; religion its towers and altars, its shrines, temples and cathedrals.

4. Both love and religion are subject to the laws of rhythm. Now the lover is elated with joy, now depressed with sadness ; the religionist now despises and scourges himself, and is now ravished with delight because he has received some token of divine favor.

5. Music and verse, the song and dance are vehicles of

expression for both. "Music is the language of the feelings as speech is of the intellect, and the theme of by far the most music of the world is either love or religion. The melodies of the one often strangely fit the words of the other, while songs and hymns have always been one of the potent aphrodisiacs of religious affection, and will remain so as long as man is thumic or pectoral and must have emotion."

6. The very many accurately prescribed forms and ceremonies employed in love making are paralleled in religion by the "elaborate rituals, litanies, modes, postures, costumes, forms of phrase, times and places to be scrupulously observed, and often a cycle of more or less formalized acts for prayer and charity, and a repetition of phrases and ceremonial righteousness generally."

7. Both have their fetiches, — "rings, tresses, handkerchiefs, and every article of dress or ornament, any one of which may and has become the only object capable of arousing genesic states. The very name assigned them, amatory fetiches, is significant. So in the history of religions, men have made idols of almost every object in nature which has been focused on to arouse crude and perverse religious feelings and sentiments. There is almost nothing that has not been worshipped, and there is a long catalogue of even seato-logical religious rites. Nearly every act and attitude have somewhere been regarded as worship, and also have elsewhere been used as passionnal provocatives."

8. Just as man has been made by woman in manifold ways and in turn has made her, so, too, has man been made by God, and in turn made Him in his own image.

9. Both hunger for a larger and fuller life, "and the best work of each is to keep the other pure."

We have, perhaps, given too much space to this topic, but its summary dismissal in a footnote by Prof. James makes it necessary to cite the very many authorities who disagree with him, and to marshal the facts which render his position untenable. The sexual instinct exerts a great influence on art, morality, thought, in fact on all life. Can it be that it has no connection with one of the oldest and most fundamental of all human experiences?

PHALLICISM.

In the religions of primitive peoples this relationship appears, as we should expect, more clearly than in those of

more advanced races. Of the many phenomena of nature which were constantly attracting the attention and consideration of primitive man, who had already begun to think, wonder, question, and seek for answers, few perhaps appeared more mysterious, and excited his curiosity more than those of procreation and reproduction. Whithersoever he turned he beheld manifestations of these powers. The clouds poured forth rain, the sun its warmth and light and presently beautiful flowers, grasses, trees, and fruits sprang out of the ground. The acorn now rotting in the forest later grew into a mighty oak, which bore countless numbers of other acorns. From the eggs of birds and fowls, other birds and fowls issued forth; but more wonderful and mysterious than all was the mode of conception and birth of his own offspring as well as that of the higher animals. But who, and what, and whence are these hidden forces which bring new life, new beings into the world? These, and other similar questions must have perplexed the mind of the savage, as they do that of a child to-day.¹ But primitive man was not so fortunate as are our children; he had no one to teach him and answer his questions; he was not the heir to the accumulated learning of thirty centuries or more. He had either to answer his questions himself or leave them unanswered. Now, of all mental states the most painful and distressing are doubt, uncertainty, perplexity, and the like. Man must have some kind of an answer to the questions which are most vital and perplexing to him, he will not rest satisfied without one. We moderns have no definite facts concerning many subjects; when we think of it there are surprisingly few subjects concerning which we do have definite and undisputed knowledge, but we have our theories, working hypotheses, beliefs, etc., which we hope either to verify or abandon in favor of better ones later on, but these are at present essential to our mental comfort and equipoise, and until we have more accurate knowledge we shall cling to them. So too with the primitive man. Every burning question received an answer immediately; generally a naïve and fanciful one, but satisfying none the less. Accordingly we find him giving a childish, and yet perfectly natural interpretation to the phenomena of nature. To him nature was not so much organic and inor-

¹ For an excellent instance of this see James's *Psychology*, Vol. 1, p. 267, where he quotes from the reminiscences of Mr. Ballard, a deaf mute.

ganic matter; he was ignorant even of the distinction. Everything possessed life; everything, like himself had personality, feeling, intellect, passion, and performed similar functions. He was a brother to the rocks and rills, the trees and plants, to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth; he and they were children of the same Pangenitor, the same mysterious Power, which is still addressed as Father. But now, who is this father? and what is his nature? Different peoples, as we shall see, gave different answers, but they all seem to have agreed on one point, namely, the Power or Powers have sex. Indeed, it could hardly have been otherwise. Primitive man could not possibly have conceived of a living, active, creative and yet sexless being, and there are many to-day for whom such a conception is impossible. Consequently we find that the tribes who were first impressed with the grandeur and mystery of the celestial bodies, personified these, considering the sun or sky, father; the moon or earth, mother; the stars, their children or lesser divinities. Those, on the other hand, who were first drawn to contemplate peculiar shaped stones, trees, rivers, etc., personified and deified these, always careful to attribute to them the appropriate sex. Hence the countless male, female, and androgynous divinities of primitive, ancient, and even some modern peoples.

Sexuality, however, was more than a mere distinguishing characteristic of the gods; it was their most important attribute. The mysterious power which created the earth and all its living creatures, and transmitted to them the power to increase and multiply, that power is surely divine, and its form or body,—primitive man must invest every force or idea with a form—is, most naturally, similar to that of his own sexual organs. Now, so long as these organs, or representations of them were regarded and perhaps reverenced as the most characteristic emblem or symbol of the Author of life, there was nothing pathological in the cult, nor even superstitious in the true sense of the word, but just so soon as their symbolic nature was forgotten, and the organs or their representations were worshipped as divinities themselves, or when the people continued to perform phallic ceremonies after they had outgrown the cult, then the religion and its practices became degenerate and pathological. “Indecent rites,” says Constant, “may be practiced by a religious peo-

ple with the greatest purity of heart. But when incredulity has gained a footing amongst these peoples, these rites become then the cause and pretext of the most revolting corruption”¹ Likewise Voltaire: “Our ideas of propriety lead us to suppose that a ceremony which appears to us infamous could only be invented by licentiousness; but it is impossible to believe that licentiousness and depravity of manners would ever have led among any people to the establishment of religious ceremonies; profligacy may have crept in in the lapse of time, but the original institution was always innocent and free from it; the early agape, in which boys and girls kissed one another modestly on the mouth, degenerated at last into secret meetings and licentiousness. It is, therefore, probable that this custom was first introduced in times of simplicity, that the first thought was to honor the Deity in the symbol of life which it has given us.”

This, indeed, is true not only of phallicism, or phallogtenism, the worship of both male and female principles. In all forms of fetishism and idolatry there are apparent several stages of degeneration from the original normal cult. At first, as has already been said, the symbol or idol is recognized as such; then it is revered and worshipped, perhaps, as the deity itself; later it becomes a mere charm or talisman against certain ills and evils; and lastly, it is used as a cloak for all kinds of licentiousness and debaucheries. After this stage, if the race or tribe is a progressive one, a reformation generally sets in.

The following are cited as illustrations of rites and ceremonies, which have undoubtedly degenerated from earlier and more innocent forms,—degenerations of which the participants and witnesses may have been wholly unconscious.

The voyager Cook describes a religious ceremony he witnessed among a certain Indian tribe as follows: “A young man, near six feet high, performed the rites of Venus with a little girl, about eleven or twelve years of age, before several of our people and a great number of the natives; but, as appeared, in perfect conformity to the custom of the place. Among the spectators were several women of superior rank, particularly Oberea, who may properly be said to have assisted at the ceremony, for they gave instruction to the girl how to perform her part.”² Voltaire, in “Les Oreilles du

¹ Human Polytheism.

² Cook’s First Voyage.

Comte de Chesterfield¹ gives a lengthy account of a similar ceremony.

Herodotus, writing of the Chaldeans, says, "Every woman born in the country must enter once during her lifetime the enclosure of the temple of Aphrodite; must there sit down and unite herself to a stranger. Many who are wealthy are too proud to mix with the rest, and repair thither in closed chariots, followed by a considerable train of slaves. The greater number seat themselves on the sacred pavement, with a cord twisted about their heads. And there is always a crowd there, coming and going; the women being divided by ropes into long lanes, down which strangers pass to make their choice. A woman who has once taken her place here cannot return home until a stranger has thrown into her lap a silver coin, and has led her away with him beyond the limits of the sacred enclosure. As he throws the money he pronounces these words: 'May the goddess Mylitta (Aphrodite) make thee happy.' The woman follows the first man who throws her the money and repels no one. When once she has accompanied him, and has thereby satisfied the goddess, she returns to her home, and from thenceforth, however large the sum offered to her, she will yield to no one." Maspero states that this custom still existed in the fifth century B. C. A similar custom is recorded in the Book of Baruch VI, 43. Orgies of this nature were of common occurrence among the Algonkins and Iroquois, and are often mentioned in the Jesuit relations. Menegas describes them as frequent among the tribes of Lower California, and Oviedo writes of certain festivals among the Nicaraguans, "during which the women of all rank extended to whosoever wished, such privileges as the matrons of ancient Babylon used to grant even to the slaves and strangers in the temple of Mylitta, as one of the duties of religion."

Excesses like these, and others even worse constituted, until quite recently, the religious rites and ceremonies of the natives of Mexico and Central America, of the Pueblo Indians of Arizona, the natives of Paraguay, the ancient Floridians, the Guayeurus of Brazil, and others.¹

Turning again to the ancient Orient we find women in Mendes submitting themselves nude and openly to the embraces of the sacred goat, which represented the incarnation

¹ See Brinton: *The Myths of the New World*, p. 175 ff.

of the procreative deity. Among the Corinthians, in certain cities in Egypt, and among the Brahmins delubral hetanism was openly practiced, and regarded as a praiseworthy act. In the Temple of Venus at Corinth there were as many as a thousand sacred prostitutes, and as many in a temple of the same goddess at Eryx. Even princesses were pallicides and took pride in the title of pallakis.¹ Of the Armenians, Strabo writes, "It is the custom of the most illustrious personages to consecrate their virgin daughters to this goddess (Anaitis). This in no way prevents them from finding husbands even after they have prostituted themselves for a long time in the temple of Anaitis. No man feels on this account any repugnance to take them as wives."² Many Greek and Roman temples were dedicated to the phallus, and filled with hetarae. We need only mention such festivals as the Bacchanalia, Floralia, Saturnalia, the Liberalia, and the festival of Venus. The scathing satires of Juvenal, who tells us in one place that every temple in Rome was practically a licensed brothel, the writings of Suetonius, Tacitus and Seneca among pagan writers; and the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, and the writings of St. Augustine among Christians all show us to what depths of moral degradation and licentiousness the Romans had fallen in their religious ceremonies and festivals. "I myself, when a young man," says St. Augustine, "used sometimes to go to the sacrilegious entertainments and spectacles; I saw the priests raving in religious excitement, and heard the choristers; I took pleasure in the shameful games which were celebrated in the honor of gods and goddesses, of the virgin Cœlestis, and of Berecynthia, the mother of all gods. And on the day consecrated to her purification, there were sung before her couch productions so obscene and filthy to the ear—I do not say of the mother of the gods, but of the mother of any senator or honest man,—nay, so impure that not even the mother of the foul-mouthed players themselves could have formed one of the audience."³

Mr. Lecky remarks that the pages of Seutonius are "an eternal witness of abysses of depravity, hideous and intolerable cruelty, and hitherto unimagined extravagances of nameless lust,"⁴ and Gibbon tells us that in writing his history

¹ Wier: *Religion and Lust*, p. 48 ff.

² Quoted by Letourneau, *Evol. of Marriage*, p. 46.

³ Civ. Dei, ii, 4.

⁴ *Hist. of European Morals*.

he was forced to leave all the licentious passages "in the obscurity of a learned language."

As late as the latter part of the eighteenth century, Priapus had his votaries almost within the shadow of the Vatican, but these rites were so obscene that they were finally abolished by episcopal command. At Lyons, in France, there was an immense wooden phallus, which the women were in the habit of scraping and steeping the wood-dust in water, which they drank as a remedy against barrenness. In other parts of France the women would embrace or glide down long pointed stones for the same reason. Indeed such practices were common throughout Europe during the Middle Ages, and have not yet entirely disappeared, according to the testimony of Prof. Sergi. It is this practice which Ezekiel so bitterly condemned. "Thou hast also taken thy fair jewels of my gold and my silver, which I have given thee, and madest to thyself images of men and didst commit whoredom with them." (xvi, 17.) Priapus was also worshipped by the Teutons, under the name Fréa, and his female consort corresponding to Venus, under the name of Friga.

The words 'fascinate' and 'fascination,' derived from the Latin 'fascinum,' which was one of the names of the male organ of generation, also point to the prevalence of this cult among the early Anglo Saxons. The 'fascinum' was worn suspended from the necks of women, and was supposed to possess magical powers; hence to fascinate. As late as the eighth century the *Judicia Sacerdotalia Criminibus* contained the following law: "If any one has performed *incantation* to the 'fascinum,' or any incantation whatever, except one who chants the creed or the Lord's Prayer, let him do penance on bread and water during three Lents." During the ninth and twelfth centuries the same law was repeated, showing that the worship of the generative principle was continuous throughout that time.

In 1247 the statutes of the Synod of Mans declared that "he who worshipped the 'fascinum' shall be seriously dealt with."

At the present day certain sects in Russia, such as the 'Christs,' the 'Skoptsy,' a few in Hungary, and Japan,¹ and the Kauchiluas of India perform religious ceremonies during which they abandon themselves to the most unbridled

¹ Edmund Buckley: *Phallicism in Japan.* Univ. of Chicago. Thesis.

depravity. In the religious ceremonies of the 'Christs' the adoration of the sacred Virgin in the person of a woman, plays a large rôle. A beautiful, robust, intelligent woman is proclaimed sacred Virgin, or niece of God. In the eyes of the 'Christs,' she is the personification of the Divinity, or rather she is the emblem of the generative force. In their chants and prayers the 'Christs' glorify mother earth, which they identify with the sacred Virgin. This principle of female deification is also one of the chief features of the religion of the Skoptsy.¹

Among the Kauchiluas these rites are carried to the most shameful and pathological extreme. During their religious ceremonies all family ties are completely obliterated, in honor of the Creator and his divine function. The women, maids and matrons, deposit their bodices in a box, each garment and each woman being numbered by a priest. At the close of the ritual of song and prayer, each male worshipper takes a bodice from the box, and the woman who has the number corresponding to that on the garment, even though it be the sister or daughter of the man who draws it, becomes his partner for the fulfillment of that which has been the subject of their worship and praise during the preceding ceremonies. This rite and the wild excesses that are sometimes incidental to it is engaged in by the most devout and pure-minded men and women, the majority of whom, when not observing this ceremony (which they consider a sacred and solemn observance of their faith), are as modest and chaste as any devotees of their more enlightened fellow beings of the western world.²

The rite of prelibation which obtained among many primitive and barbarous people, and is still practiced by some of them, belongs to this category of rites. In Malabar the queen herself, as well as her meanest subject, had to submit to this rite exercised by the high priest, who was given the first three nights and paid fifty pieces of gold besides.³

In Cambodia, De Remusat tells us, the daughters of poor parents retain their virginity longer than their richer sisters, simply because they have not the money with which to pay the priest for defloration. An analogous custom is the 'jus primæ noctis' practiced by many tribes, according to which

¹ N. Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire*, pp. 63-97.

² Howard: *Sex Worship*, p. 149 ff.

³ Letourneau: *Evolution of Marriage*, p. 48.

the woman on her bridal night has to yield herself up to the male marriage guests. Another variation of this rite was the sacrifice of maidenhood to an image of the Creator. This custom prevailed in Rome, where the marriage laws required the bride to sacrifice her virginity to Priapus before the nuptials could be consummated. This she did immediately after the marriage ceremony, in the presence of her husband, parents, and friends. The object of the ceremony was both to render unto God His due, and to become fruitful by the contact with the image of the Creator.¹

Again, the worship of certain animals, such as the serpent, the bull, the goat, the cock, the tortoise, etc., the worship of trees, such as the pine, fir, oak, fig, palm, etc., the worship of plants, vegetables and cereals, such as the lotus, the onion, rice, maize, turnip, sweet potato, etc., the worship of mounds, rocks, stone pillars, — all these have a more or less phallic significance, and are degenerations of purer and more primitive forms of natural religion.²

The above, it is hoped, is sufficient to show not only the close connection between the religious and sexual impulses, but also the great dangers, physical, mental, and moral, which attend the uncontrolled expression of each. The importance of the subject, especially to religious teachers who have adolescents in their charge, cannot be emphasized too strongly. Sound pedagogy here is more necessary than in any other field of education, religious or secular.

RENUNCIATION AND RESTRAINT.

The degenerations thus far considered are paralleled in many religions by others of an opposite and even more injurious nature. In every age and land there have been those who imagined that their deities are best served when all sexual affairs are abstained from, when the sexual nature is completely abnegated. For many of these, mere continence or celibacy is not sufficient; the sexual organs must be extirpated. This practice has at one time or another been performed in all parts of the globe. The ceremony of castration formed a part of the annual celebration of the festival of Attis and Cybele. According to the legend, Cybele, the earth or mother goddess, fell in love with the beautiful youth

¹ Howard: *Sex Worship*, p. 88.

² See works cited above and Lefevre, *La Religion*, p. 58 ff.

Attis, of whom she made a priest and exacted the vow of chastity. Attis, however, having broken his vow for the sake of a lovely nymph, was deprived of his reason by the goddess, and in his frenzy he castrated himself, whereupon the goddess ordained that thereafter all her priests should be eunuchs.

In commemoration of this legend, there was held each year, in the spring time, a wild and noisy, yet sacred and solemn festival. It began in quiet and sorrow for the death-like sleep of Attis. On the third day joy broke forth and was manifested by delirious hilarity. The frenzied priests of Cybele rushed about in bands, with haggard eyes and dishevelled hair, like drunken revelers and insane women. In one hand they carried burning fire-brands, and in the other they brandished the sacred knife. They dashed into the woods and valleys, and climbed the mountain heights, keeping up a horrible noise and continual groaning. An intoxicating drink rendered them wild. They beat each other with the chains they carried, and when they drew blood upon their companions or themselves, they danced with wild and tumultuous gesticulations, flogging their backs and piercing their limbs and even their bodies. Finally, in honor of their goddess, they turned the sacred knife upon their genitals, and calling upon their deity showed their gaping wounds and offered her the spoils of their destroyed vitality. After recovering from this self-inflicted emasculation, these initiates adopted woman's dress, and were then ready to become priests or, failing in that, to take their place among the attendants of the temple, and engage in pederasty for the benefit of the temple treasury, whenever the patrons might prefer such indulgence to that afforded by the consecrated women.¹

Among the Pueblo Indians there are mujerados or emasculated men who serve as hetarae to the chiefs and shamans. As a result of the terrible abuses to which they subject themselves in order to become mujerados, the testicles and penis atrophy, the hair of the beard falls out, the voice loses its depth and compass, and physical strength and energy decrease. The mujerado becomes feminine in his inclinations and disposition, takes on feminine manners and customs, associates with women, and loses his position in society as a man. He is held, however, in high honor for religious rea-

¹ Howard: *Sex Worship*, p. 77 seq.

sons. The ceremonies take place in the spring when the life-principle is exceedingly active.¹

“Masculine heterism,” writes Letourneau, “is still in vogue among many primitive peoples, and is distinctly a religious rite. The Canats of New Caledonia frequently assemble at night in a cabin to give themselves up to this kind of debauchery.”²

“Certain classes of Aztec priesthood practiced complete abscission or discepcion of the virile parts, and a mutilation of females was not unknown, similar to that which has existed immemorially in Egypt.”³ When the Spanish missionaries reached Southern California they found some of the native males dressed as women and assuming their part. Indeed, it may be said that in the whole of North and South America such and similar customs have existed, and in some parts exist to the present day. Castration is to-day the fundamental tenet of the Skoptsy of Russia, who quote in justification of their beliefs and practices, Matt. 19: 12, in which Christ says to his disciples, “There are some eunuchs which were born so from their mother’s womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be some eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake.”

The motives which lie behind these practices are many and varied. Among primitive peoples the practice was probably of accidental origin and was perpetuated because it rendered the subjects peculiar and gained for them the respect and reverence of their fellows who considered them, on that account, as somehow or other divine. Or it may have originated in the perverted sexual instinct still manifested by some tramps and degenerates who possess many atavistic traits and in other respects closely resemble their primitive prototypes.⁴

Another motive is to be found in the strong desire to please and propitiate the deity by sacrificing the greatest of human blessings and pleasures in accordance with the ancient and widespread belief that God is best pleased when His creatures are most miserable, and hence, the greater the sacrifice, the greater the pleasure afforded Him. Again, the desire to stifle the promptings of the carnal nature, to renounce all

¹ See Krafft-Ebing: *Psychopathia Sexualis*, p. 201; Hammond: Impotence in the Male.

² *Evol. of Marriage*, p. 62.

³ Brinton: *Myths of the New World*, p. 173.

⁴ See Josiah Flint’s article in Havelock Ellis’s *Psych. of Sex*.

worldly affairs, maintain purity of morals, and to wrap themselves entirely in God were the motives which prompted the struggles of the early Christian Fathers and the many devotees who have since followed in their footsteps.

These motives we have enumerated are, of course, the most superficial ones. The real and ultimate motives or causes are to be found in the temperaments of the peoples, the nature of the psychic soils or nervous systems whence spring these beliefs and practices. That is, if we wish to understand why some peoples give themselves up to excessive sexual indulgence and entertain beliefs which justify them, while others entertain beliefs which justify their excessive restraint of natural impulses, we must look for the causes not in the beliefs, but in the antecedent and more fundamental factors, such as climate, soil, food-products, the nature and spirit of the age, the influence of heredity, suggestion, imitation, etc., all of which combined, shape the minds and determine the beliefs and conduct of men to an extent which is incalculable. In other words, we must go to geography, psychology, and their kindred sciences for our answers, and not to the various theologies.

HATE AND ANGER.

The opposite of love is hate, and like the opposite sides of a shield they are always together. The good lover is also a good hater, and *vice versa*. He who loves God, virtue, honor, truth, beauty, etc., must hate the devil, baseness, falsehood, ugliness, etc.

“In the love of Christ and his maid-mother,” confessed Queen Isabella, “I have caused great misery, and have depopulated towns and districts, provinces and kingdoms.” In Spain alone, it is estimated that down to the year 1809 about 350,000 were either burnt or imprisoned and persecuted in the name of religion. And in all times intense lovers of God have cried out: “Shall I not hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee, and rise up against them that rise up against Thee? Yea I hate them right sore, as if they were mine enemies.”¹

It was the furious hatred for the Prince of the power of air that blinded the God-loving and otherwise level-headed Puritans, and made the witchcraft madness possible among them.

¹ St. Luke, 14:26, 27.

Believing, as they did, that Satan with his confederates, the witches, were about to make an onslaught upon the New World, they determined to fight him and them to the bitter end and exterminate them from the land. Writes one of their contemporaries, . . . “the Devil is now making one Attempt more upon us, an Attempt more difficult, more surprising, more snarled with unintelligible circumstances, than any that we have hitherto encountered; an Attempt so critical that if we get well through, we shall soon enjoy Halycon Days, with all the Vultures of Hell trodden under our feet.”¹

Jonathan Edwards in “The End of the Wicked Contemplated by the Righteous; or the Torments of the Wicked in Hell no Occasion of Grief to the Saints in Heaven,” says, “When they have this sight it will excite them to joyful praises.” “The damned and their miseries, their sufferings and the wrath of God poured out upon them will be an occasion of joy to them.” Andrew Wellwood says, picturing the future, “I am overjoyed in hearing the everlasting howlings of the haters of the Almighty. What a pleasant melody are they in mine ears! O, Eternal hallelujahs to Jehova and the Lamb! O, sweet! sweet! My heart is satisfied. We committed our cause to Thee that judgeth righteously, and behold Thou hast fully pleaded our Cause, and shall make the smoke of their torment forever and ever to ascend in our sight.”²

Even the great Preacher Himself, He who preached to the world the Gospel of Love, declared, “If any one come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple; and whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after Me, cannot be My disciple.”

These injunctions were too literally obeyed by very many ascetics and fanatics of succeeding generations. St. Jerome, exulting in his own atrophied and diseased feelings, tells Heliodorus, whom he exhorts to leave his family and become a hermit, “Though your little nephew twine his arms around your neck; though your mother, with dishevelled hair and tearing her robe asunder, point to the breast with which she suckled you; though your father fall down on the threshold before you, pass on over your father’s body. Fly with tear-

¹ Quoted in R. H. Allen, *The New England Tragedies in Prose*, p. 97.

² Colin Scott: *Old Age and Death*: Am. Jour. Psych. Vol. 8, p. 111. See also Davenport: *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*, *passim*.

less eyes to the banner of the cross. In this matter cruelty is the only piety. . . . Your widowed sister may throw her gentle arms around you. . . . Your father may implore you to wait but a short time to bury those near to you, who will soon be no more; your weeping mother may recall your childish days, and may point to her shrunken breast and to her wrinkled brow. Those around you may tell you that all the household rests upon you. Such chains as these, the love of God and the fear of hell can easily break. You say that Scripture orders you to obey your parents, but he who loves them more than Christ loses his soul, etc.' The Lives of the Saints are full of accounts of the cruelties of their subjects to their parents and nearest kin. Indeed, it seems that the Christianity of the Middle Ages was a religion of hate and cruelty and not of love and kindness as its Founder and His disciples intended it to be. 'To outrage the affections of the nearest and dearest relations,' writes Mr. Lecky, 'was usually regarded not only as innocent, but proposed as the highest virtue. 'A young man,' it was acutely said, 'who has learnt to despise a mother's grief, will easily bear any other labor that is imposed upon him.''¹

Indeed, to tell the story of religious hate, the rôle it has played in the history of mankind, would require the recounting of all the religious wars, massacres, holocausts, inquisitions, and persecutions, the perusal of which sickens the soul, and makes passionate men cry out against religion itself. The Old Testament fairly teems with accounts of fierce wars and massacres and inhuman deeds which were due to the intense hate of Israel for all unbelievers and enemies of their Jehovah. The pagan Roman hated and persecuted the early Christian, later the Catholics and Protestants hated and persecuted each other, both hated the Jew, Mohammedan, heathen and atheist, and all have heartily despised each other. We cannot, of course, enter into details, or treat the subject even in its barest outlines. To do so would require a volume in itself. Suffice it to say that while love is the keynote of almost all religious teachings, both oral and written, hate has played the leading rôle in religious history, and made it one long religious tragedy.

Mention should here be made of a peculiar religion which seems to have been born entirely of hate and cruelty. It is

¹ History of European Morals, Vol. 2, p. 142.

called *Thugism*, and was discovered in India by the English in the early part of the nineteenth century. The beginnings of this sect reach back to legendary times. According to an ancient Hindu myth a demon once roamed over the earth and devoured human beings as fast as they were created. Of such gigantic size was he that he could wade across the ocean, and in the most unfathomable parts the water would not reach his waist. There was no earthly power that could restrain him, and for a long time he kept the world unpeopled. Finally Kalee or Devi, the goddess of destruction, came to the rescue. She attacked the demon, and cut him down; but from every drop of his blood another demon arose; and though the goddess continued to cut down these rising demons with wonderful alacrity and skill, fresh broods of demons sprang from their blood, as from that of their progenitors; and the diabolical race consequently multiplied with fearful rapidity. The never ending labor of cutting down demons, whose number was only increased by this operation of pruning, at length fatigued and disheartened the goddess; she found it necessary to make a change in her tactics;—and here the tale which is thus far received by all Hindoos becomes subject to variations. According to Thug mythology, the goddess, when she became embarrassed by the constant reinforcements of the demon army, which accrued from her labors, relinquished all personal efforts for their suppression, and formed two men from the perspiration brushed from her arms. To each of these men she gave a handkerchief with which they were commanded to put all demons to death, without shedding a drop of blood. Her commands were faithfully executed; and the demons were all strangled without delay. The champions, having vanquished all the demons, offered to return the handkerchiefs, but their patroness, in the spirit of a grateful goddess, desired that they would retain them, not merely as memorials of their heroism, but as implements of a lucrative trade in which their descendants were to labor and thrive. They were not only permitted but commanded to strangle men as they had strangled demons.¹

This explanation of the origin and work of their diabolical order is, on the face of it, one which was manufactured *post rem* to justify some long series of murders and robberies and

¹ "Illustrations of the History and Practices of the Thugs." Anonymous, London, 1837.

later served, as shall be seen, as an incentive to commit many more such crimes.

There is no doubt, however, that the Thugs, when discovered by the English in the early part of the nineteenth century regarded themselves as devotees engaged in the service of their deity. They committed their murders according to rigidly prescribed forms ; only after the performance of special religious rites, and always scrupulously divided the spoils with their goddess. The instruments of murder and burial were held by them in the highest veneration. An oath taken by the pick-axe was as binding to them as the Koran is to the Mohammedan, or the Bible to the Christian. That they did not consider themselves murderers, but merely agents working out the will of their goddess, is evident from the replies which one of the Thugs gave to his questioner. Q. "How many people have you in the course of your life killed with your own hands, at a rough guess?" A. "I have killed none." Q. "Have you not been just describing to me a number of murders?" A. "Yes; but do you suppose I could have committed them? Is any man killed from man's killing? Is it not the hand of God that kills him, and are we not mere instruments in the hand of God?" And another on being asked whether he never felt compunction in murdering innocent people, answered with a smile, "Does any man feel compunction in following his trade? And are not all our trades assigned us by Providence?" The Thug believed he was 'called' to be a slayer of men, and piously obeyed the 'call.' "He educated his children to pursue the same career, instilling into their minds, at the earliest age, that Thuggee is the noblest profession a man can follow, and that the dark goddess they worship will always provide rich travellers for her zealous devotees."¹

These beliefs remind us immediately of the total depravity and fatalistic predestination doctrines of Calvin and Jonathan Edwards, in which there is, perhaps, more hate than love. Again, Luther's 'fated will' doctrine is similar. "The human will," says Luther, "is like a beast of burden. If God mounts it, it wishes and goes as God wills; if Satan mounts it, it wishes and goes as Satan wills. Nor can it choose the rider it would prefer, or betake itself to him, but it is the riders who contend for its possession." It is need-

¹ Mackay : *Popular Delusions*, Vol. 1, p. 382.

less to point out that such doctrines annihilate at one sweep all moral responsibility, and can be used as a convenient cloak to cover a multitude of sins, even the worst.

In the northern part of Russia there is a religious sect resembling in some respects the Thugs. Little, however, is known of these except that they adore St. Nicholas, the 'chicken thief,' who is considered the patron saint of all thieves, and aids them in their enterprises. These religious thieves have also recourse to other supernatural forces. They sometimes disinter the dead, considering it as a talisman to have about them the finger or hand of a corpse, or a taper made of human fat.¹ There is another, and more pathological sect in Russia, which belongs to this category. This sect, known as the *Religious Suicides*, teaches that the world must soon crumble to pieces and perish, and therefore it is behooving to leave this life of vanity and sin, and seek surcease from all ills in death. To those who consent to give up their lives they promise deliverance from the eternal torments of hell, and the delights of paradise. Their chants are characterized by a mournful despair, and hate of life. The following is one of the methods employed by some of these sectarians to rid themselves of their unhappy lives. The convert having expressed his desire to die is brought into an uninhabited hut accompanied only by the preacher who reads the Psalms. At the end of a certain time, a door opens, and the emblem of death presents himself, — a large, robust man clothed in a red robe. Placing a cushion over the head of the convert he seats himself on it and remains in that position until the unfortunate fanatic is asphyxiated. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were, along the banks of the Volga, a large number of preachers belonging to several different sects who preached salvation by suicide, and made numerous converts. These would gather with their wives and children in some cave or wood and after certain ceremonies would massacre each other. Individual cases of religious suicide are still frequent in Russia, but suicides *en masse* have ceased owing to police surveillance.²

PITY.

It would be difficult indeed to overestimate the rôle that

¹ Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire*, p. 14.

² See N. Tsakni: *op. cit.*, pp. 97-118; also M. Collindau: *Le Delire Religieux*, *Bull. de la Soc. d'Anthrop. de Paris*, Vol. 10, 1875.

pity has played not only in the religious life, but in the secular life as well. President Hall,¹ in one of his searching articles, has shown what a large and important part it plays in the lives of children and adults; and Herbart, as we have already seen, considered it the essential principle of religion. In both the Old and New Testaments God is called a merciful and pitying God, and want of pity is considered an unpardonable sin. "For three transgressions of Edom, and for four (saith the Lord), I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath forever."² Some writers have spoken of pity as the essential teaching of Christianity. It certainly takes rank next to love. "The sentiment of pity," writes President Hall, "has played a rôle of supreme importance in the spread of Christianity. Hundreds of returns specify particularly all the experiences of Passion week. Some are most completely melted at the desertion of Christ by his disciples, others at the betrayal, others by his struggles of soul with himself and with the Father in Gethsemane, but most prominent of all in this galaxy of incitations to pathos is the crucifixion itself and the incidents connected with it. The stations of the Cross are often mentioned; Christ commanding his mother to the care of the beloved disciple; the prayer, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do; Christ met by his mother on the way to Calvary; taken from the Cross and laid upon the bosom of the mother of sorrows; the scene where Christ is stripped of his garments, his flesh bruised and torn from the scourging; the long journey up the hill with the heavy Cross and the three falls under its weight; Mary at the foot of the Cross seeing the Divine Son suffer and unable to even wipe the blood from his face."

But these incidents do not bring tears to the eyes of all. God on the Cross would not excite pity in Nietzsche, for instance; he would turn away from such a spectacle with shame and scorn. The 'Übermensch,' he tells us, "maketh his law to be ashamed in the presence of all that suffereth." And again, "Thus the devil once said unto me: 'Even God hath his own hell: that is his love unto men,' . . . And recently I heard the word said: 'God is dead; he hath died

¹ Saunders and Hall: "Pity," *Amer. Jour. Psy.*, Vol. 11, July, 1900.

² Amos, 1:11.

of his pity for man.' ' Zeno and Spinoza regard pity, bad in itself, and Darwin in his theory of the 'survival of the fittest' has little or no room for it. But the 'survival of the fittest' law is unfit for civilized men, as indeed it is for all the higher animals. Were this the supreme and inviolable law of nature the higher form of life could not have evolved. The higher the animal is in the scale of life the fewer are its offspring, and the greater and longer are their periods of helplessness. Had not nature, therefore, evolved love, and pity, and sympathy, these offspring would, according to the above law, be either devoured or left to perish. But nature has implanted the tender instincts in the hearts of parents, and as a consequence we find them instinctively violating Darwin's law and risking their lives for the survival of the weak and the unfit. M. Kropatkin, in his recent masterly work, *Mutual Aid*, shows convincingly that the severe 'struggle for survival,' of which so much has been made since Darwin, is more or less a myth. Mutual aid rather than mutual destruction is, according to him, the reigning law in the animal world. From love and pity of one's own progeny, these emotions irradiate and cover the progeny of others of the same species, and finally to everything that is powerless and helpless, the young and old alike. In man these emotions are sometimes so highly developed as to be entirely divorced from reason. Man loves and pities he knows not why, and not infrequently when he knows he should not. From this to a pathological development of pity is but a short step.

The true pedagogy of pity is, as President Hall has shown, not to eradicate it entirely from the soul, nor on the other hand to lavish it promiscuously and indiscriminately upon "the undervitalized poor, the moribund sick, defectives, and criminals, because by aiding such to survive, the process of wholesome natural selection by which all that is best has hitherto been developed, will be interfered with. Pity needs new ideals. Its work is no longer the salvage of the wreckage of humanity, but if Jesus came to our biological age he would be crucified afresh in the thwarted ambitions and blighted ideals of those most noble, yet most often crushed by circumstances, over which they have no control. Pity has as its highest office then, in removing handicaps from those most able to help man to higher levels, — the leaders on more exalted plains who can be of most aid in ushering in the king-

dom of the superman." In other words we must learn not to cease to pity but to pity aright.

Like the other emotions, pity has, at times, been unduly focused upon and led to many morbid excesses. Pity and sympathy are the nearest approaches we have to suffering and pain, and in some cases they actually pass over into the latter. Cases of religious stigmatization, like that of St. Francis of Assissi and Louise Lateau, are the most extreme and pathological examples of this. For more than four years blood flowed regularly every Friday from the left side of the latter's chest, from both feet, the palms and backs of both hands, and also her forehead. According to her physician, Dr. Lefebvre, the quantity of blood lost on each occasion was about seven-eights of a quart.¹

In many of President Hall's returns a single incident was singled out of a whole situation. The very sound of the word 'nail' produced a nervous shudder in one; another, "on seeing old nails that looked antique felt a pain in her palms, and sometimes in her feet from the strength of her imagination." Still another felt them so intensely that it seems quite likely "that she is well on toward stigmata."² In all, twenty-eight were profoundly affected by nail items; others centered on the sharp thorns, the vinegar, falling under the cross, trial before Pilate, etc.

The religious sect which has focused upon pity more, perhaps, than any other, is that of the Jains of India. These believe that every object, even plants, minerals, water, fire, etc., possesses a soul, and therefore they abstain from destroying even the minutest animal, deeming the destruction of any sentient creature the most heinous of crimes. Lest they should accidentally tread upon an insect they always carry at their girdles a small broom with which they tenderly sweep aside every insect which they may observe in their path. "To so senseless a length do they carry this principle, that they will not pluck any herb or vegetable, or partake of any sort of food, which may be supposed to contain animalculæ; so that the only articles of sustenance remaining to them appear to be rice, and a few sorts of pulse, which they cook with milk. They affirm, indeed, that it is as foul a murder to kill an insect as to slay a man; and so extreme is their precaution to avoid the commission of the crime, that it

¹ F. W. H. Myers: *Human Personality*, Vol. 1, p. 492.

² Saunders and Hall: *Am. Jour. Psy.*, vol. 11, p. 559.

is with great reluctance, and only when reduced to the necessity by urgent thirst, that they will drink water; even then they invariably suck up the fluid through a piece of fine muslin. In like manner when they require water for ablution, or any unavoidable household purpose, they carefully strain it repeatedly before they venture to use it. The most noxious vermin and insects are also treated with the same consideration as the most harmless creatures; and if, through persevering annoyance, they are compelled to deprive certain odious insects of the asylum usually found upon their persons, they remove the tormentors with the utmost care, and tenderly place them out of harm's way.”¹ This is closely paralleled by the beliefs and actions of the Doukhobors in Canada, who refuse to eat meat, and to own and work with animals, etc.; by the intense pity which some women and children have for animals, insects, plants, and even inanimate objects, such as locomotives when ‘puffing,’ “the moon when black clouds pass over it,” etc.

Again this sentiment becomes almost pathological among vegetarians, and in the nervous and violent crusades against vivisection, even of the most humane, painless, and scientific kind.

FEAR.

“Fear is the father of religion, love her late-born daughter.” In every age and land there have been those who have held that fear is the source of all religions. King Solomon declared that, “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge,” and had he been speaking of the origin of religion he would have probably added ‘and of religion.’ Petronius long ago sang, “Fear first made the gods,” and in our own day, to mention only a few, D’Alviella, and Alfred Maury, from whom we quote the first sentence, regard this sentiment as one root of religion of which the other is love. The Italian anthropologist, Sergi, offers many ingenious arguments to prove that one of the main roots of all religions is irrational fear, due to man’s ignorance of natural laws; and Paul Carus evidently agrees with Petronius when he writes, “Demonolatry or Devil worship is the first stage in the evolution of religion, for we fear the bad not the good.”²

These views are, of course, extreme and partial, like some

¹ Dict. of all Religions.

² Hist. of the Devil.

of those concerning love. Nevertheless, it is true that fear has played and still plays, in the religion of all peoples, a rôle hardly second to that of any other emotion, and therefore merits the great importance attached to it. If it be true, as Dr. Robertson Smith says, that the spirit of many primitive religions is "predominantly joyous," it is no less true that the spirit of as many more is predominantly timid, and in few, if any, is the element of fear entirely absent. Every bright god has his shadow, so to say; and under the influence of Dualism this shadow attained a distinct existence and personality in the popular imagination.¹

Primitive and ancient peoples have their 'kakodaimonai' as well as their 'eudaimonai,' their demons as well as their divinities, their Ahrimans as well as their Ormuzds. This holds true even of the Jews and Christians. The God of these people is at one time, a loving and merciful God, an indulgent "Father that pitith his children;" at another time he is jealous and vindictive, a 'consuming fire,' who "visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation." The blessings promised to the obedient are indeed great, but the curses heaped upon the disobedient are even greater.² He has his glorious heaven and his burning hell, and Christian and Jew love and praise him when he is in his happy mood, and fear and dread him when he is in his angry mood. "Rejoice in the Lord, praise him with harp: sing unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings," exhorts the Psalmist; and a few lines further on he says; "Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him." This is precisely what most religious people do; they rejoice in the Lord, but they also stand in awe of him. The two emotions, love and fear, are correlative and opposite, just as heat and cold, light and darkness, good and evil, etc., and an excess of one expels the other. One of the best studies of fear from the point of view of its influence on the lives and actions of men, is that of President Hall.³

The following summary, taken from his article will, it is believed, be of interest to the reader. In reply to his questionnaire 1,701 persons answered, describing 6,456 fears, which he groups according to the objects feared, as follows:

¹ M. D. Conway: Demonolatry and Folklore, Vol. 1, p. 14.

² Cf. Deut. 27, and Lev. 21, *et seq.*

³ Amer. Jour. Psy., Vol. 8, No. 2.

TABLE I.

CELESTIAL PHENOMENA		ANIMALS.	
Thunder and lightning,	603	Reptiles,	483
High wind,	143	Domestic animals,	268
Cyclones,	67	Wild animals,	206
Clouds and their forms,	44	Insects,	203
Meteors,	34	Rats and mice,	196
Northern lights,	25	Cats and dogs,	79
Comets,	18	Birds,	51
Fog,	16		—
Storms,	14		1,486
Eclipses,	14		
Extreme hot water,	10	Fire,	365
Extreme cold water,	8	Water,	205
—	—	Drowning,	57
	996		—
			627
Darkness,	432		
Ghosts,	203	Strange persons,	436
Dream fears,	109	Robbers,	153
Solitude,	55		—
—	—		589
	799		
		Death,	299
		Disease,	241
			—
			540

" This accounts for 5,037 fears, leaving 1,419 directed to many scores of objects to be discussed later. It would appear that thunderstorms are feared most, that reptiles follow, with strangers and darkness as close seconds, while fire, death, domestic animals, diseases, wild animals, water, ghosts, insects, rats and mice, robbers, high winds, dream fears, cats and dogs, cyclones, solitude, drowning, birds, etc., represent decreasing degrees of fearfulness. When we specify reptiles, domestic animals, insects, birds, the kinds of disease, strangers, dream fears, and add miscellaneous fears, we have in all 298 objects feared."

Here we have 298 objects feared by normal children, living in a relatively highly civilized and organized society, under the most favorable and protected conditions. The query naturally arises, how much larger the catalogue would be, and how much more intense the fears of primitive man (an adult child) who roamed about the primeval forests almost wholly unprotected from the forces of nature, and the animals about him, and to whom all natural phenomena appeared more or less mysterious and therefore terrible? The answer is readily found in the many demonolatries, and the countless demons of primitive peoples. Hunger, disease, death, dreams, darkness, ghosts, heat, cold, the elements,

animals, insects, worms, trees and plants, and even inanimate objects have at one time or another been demonized and made the objects of religious worship.

What fear has meant in religion, even the highest forms of it, can be seen from the fact that no less than 518 references are made to it in the Old and New Testaments. We shall later on speak a little more fully concerning its influence on the religions of primitive and ancient peoples.

Like pity, fear is an emotion which men like Nietzsche, Ibsen, Wilde, and others regard as base and slavish. They have nothing but contempt for it, and would eliminate it entirely from the soul of man. But how much smaller our lives would be were this done can be seen from President Hall's study. Indeed, it would be almost as disastrous as the loss of one of our faculties. Fear is in a large sense the beginning of wisdom and prudence. "Never is the child's charm in an object," writes President Hall, "so great as at the moment when he is just getting the better of his fear of it. One of the chief spurs to knowledge and science is to overcome fear, and many of the things now best known are those that used to be most feared. To feel a given fear no longer over but beneath us gives an exquisite joy of growth." Fear is the result of the experiences of the race, and in a moderate degree is a means of protection. The pedagogic problem here, as with pity and anger, is not to eliminate the emotion, but to "gauge it to the power of proper reaction," to learn, in the words of Aristotle, "to fear in due proportion those things worthy of being feared."

MORBID FEARS.

If, as has been said, the total absence of fear is a deplorable deficiency, an excess of it is still more distressing and alienating. We need only mention the following morbid fears, and it will at once appear how widespread its baneful influence may become.

Agophobia, or fear of open spaces ;
Claustrophobia, " " " enclosed spaces ;
Clitrophobia, " " " " " ;
Topophobia, " " " all spaces or space ;
Astrophobia, " " " lightning ;
Anthropophobia, " " " crowds ;
Monophobia, " " " solitude ;

Panphobia,	or fear of everything ;
Misophobia,	" " " dirt ;
Vokophobia,	" " to return home ;
Hypsophobia,	" " of heights ;
Botophobia,	" " " cellars ; ¹

To these we may add Theophobia and Peccatiphobia, the fear of God and the fear of sinning, which become genuine obsessions among very many religionists.

The cultured modern attributes his pleasures and successes, his sufferings and reverses, to natural causes, even though he be unable to say what these causes are. But this is by no means true of all moderns. The late assassination of our president, for instance, the Galveston flood, Baltimore fire, the Iroquois and Slocum disasters, and all national calamities are still looked upon by the masses as the punishments of God for national or local sins. Now this is precisely the belief of primitive, barbarous, and uncivilized men the world over. To them natural causes, in the scientific sense of the word, are, of course, unknown, — the joys of life spring from the blessings of a benevolent god, its misfortunes from curses of an angry deity who has been neglected or sinned against, or else the work of a demon who takes a fiendish delight in the sufferings of man. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the peoples whose environments were unfavorable, and whose struggle for existence was therefore especially severe, should have centered their thoughts upon the evil side of their deities, or upon deities wholly evil, and exhausted their intellectual resources in endeavoring to propitiate them and gain their favor.

Again, whenever a people have strayed for a long time from the straight and narrow path of religion and morality, there is always an Elijah, who in thundering words commands them to halt ere they fall headlong into the yawning pits of hell ; who wakes them to a lively realization of their sinful and dangerous condition, points the way back, and if needs be lashes and frightens them into it. These Elijahs, however, are the children of the people, the products of the needs of their respective times. The well-known law, action equals reaction in the opposite direction, is as true in the psychical realm as in the physical. The algedonic pendulum swings from pleasure to pain, from joy to sorrow, from cour-

¹ Kovalewsky : *Folie du doute*, *Jour. Mental Science*, 1887.

age to fear, and the higher it rises in one direction, the higher will it afterwards rise in the opposite direction. Indeed, this is true of all human life, as is so much evidenced by the history of nations. We need only recall the golden ages of Egypt, Judea, Greece and Rome, the dark ages which followed them, and then the Renaissance, upon whose crest we now ride, in order to see the above law of psychic rhythm in action.

In the light of these facts we shall be the better able to understand the Great Awakening of 1740 which spread over New England, the Kentucky Revival, the demonolatries of primitive peoples, sacrifices, etc.

THE GREAT AWAKENING.

When we remember the early history of the Puritans, the land they settled in, its barren and rocky soil, with sky overcast and weather none too clement, the forests gloomy and unexplored, and Indians with their tomahawks, bows and arrows, and wild warwhoops lurking everywhere, we see at once that they had passed through a period of terrible 'sturm und drang' in which the attention had been preoccupied almost exclusively with immediate problems and religious matters largely neglected. Later, when the Indians had been conquered, the forests cleared, the soil cultivated and the villages built, when comfort and leisure were common possessions a violent reaction took place; men began to reflect upon the loose and sinful lives they had been leading, were greatly concerned with the sad state of their souls, and the possibility of being severely punished for their wickedness. This reaction or conversion, significantly designated The Great Awakening, was ushered in by Jonathan Edwards and continued by Whitefield, Wheelock, Parsons, Bellamy, Davenport, and others. The process of conversion, though normal, healthy, and almost imperceptible, when the previous life has been orderly and under proper control, is not so when the previous life has undergone a severe strain, or has been loose and sinful. Such lives need general overhauling and cleaning, and heroic measures must be resorted to. However, religious enthusiasts are too apt to overestimate the corruption and sinfulness of the people, and their unjustifiably strenuous methods are productive of the worst evils, especially among those of weak mental or physical constitutions,

who need hope, and comfort, and sympathy, instead of anger, reproach and terrifying sermons. "I would say, once for all," writes Dr. Clouston, "about unusual religious services, exciting preaching, and 'revival meetings,' that, as a physician, I have no objection to them at all, rather the contrary, but I think they are only suited to stolid, healthy brains, and should on no account be attended by persons with weak heads, excitable dispositions, and neurotic constitutions."¹

But such people are to be found in every crowd, audience, and congregation, and therefore ministers should especially be careful not to play too strongly upon the emotions of their hearers; for religion, as has been said, is an all-absorbing topic with many people; its principles lie deep imbedded in their hearts and brains, and influence their lives from the cradle almost to the grave.

The very titles of many of the sermons preached during the Awakening such, for example, as "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," "Wrath upon the wicked to the uttermost," "The Eternity of Hell Torments," "The future punishment of the wicked unavoidable and intolerable," etc., are sufficiently indicative of their contents, and the effects produced upon the hearers may readily be imagined.

Never before were the wrath of God and torments of hell painted in such lurid and flaming colors, not even by Dante or Milton, and it is not surprising, therefore, to read that strong men and women, and, worst of all, little children, were literally frightened out of their wits.

A little child, after hearing Whitefield preach, took sick, and saying it would go to Mr. Whitefield's God, died in a short time. "This," says Whitefield, "encouraged me to speak to the little ones. But O, how were the old people affected when I said, 'Little children, if your parents will not come to Christ, do you come and go to heaven without them. There seemed to be but few dry eyes, look where I would. I have not seen a greater commotion since my preaching at Boston.'²

Indeed, these preachers considered their efforts a failure if they could not cause weeping, shrieking, crying, wailing, fainting, and convulsive fits to be seen and heard in every corner.

Chauncy, in his "Seasonable Thoughts upon the state of

¹ Mental Diseases, p. 45.

² Quoted in Tracy. "The Great Awakening," p. 95.

Religion in New England," writes, "An account of Mr. Davenport's preaching . . . a gentleman in Connecticut wrote to one of the ministers of this town, upon his own knowledge, in these words: 'At length he turned his discourse to others and with the utmost strength of his lungs addressed himself to the congregation under these and such-like expressions, viz.: You poor unconverted creatures in the seats, in the pews, in the galleries, I wonder you don't drop into Hell! It would not surprise me. I should not wonder at it, if I should see you drop down this minute into Hell. You Pharisees, hypocrites; now, now, now you are going right into the bottom of Hell! I wonder you don't drop into Hell by scores and hundreds,' etc. And in this manner he ended the sermon! . . . After a short prayer he called for all the distressed persons (which were near twenty) into the foremost seats. Then he came out of the pulpit and stripped off his upper garments and got up into the seats and leaped up and down some times and clapped his hands together and cried out in these words: 'The war goes on, the fight goes on, the Devil goes down, the Devil goes down;' and then betook himself to stamping and screaming most dreadfully. And what is it more than might be expected to see people so affrighted as to fall into shrieks and fits under such methods as these?'"

Happily, he was arrested, adjudged insane, and prevented from continuing his shameful performances. Such sermons and emotional disorders, however, became the fashion of the day, and we find "men of all occupations who are vain enough to think themselves fit to be teachers of others," "of no learning" and "small capacities," "babes in age as well as in understanding," "chiefly young persons, sometimes lads or rather boys—nay women and girls"—even "negroes" travelling through the colonies spreading gloom, despair, and melancholy wherever they went, and exhorting the people to "press into the Kingdom," to force God, so to speak, to admit them into Paradise. The following from the Boston Post-Boy, No. 301, will illustrate their methods: "Their main design in preaching seems not so much to inform men's judgments, as to terrify and affright their imaginations: by awful words and frightful representations to set the congregation into hideous shrieks and outcries. And to this end, and in every place where they come, they represent that God is doing extraordinary things in other places, and that they are

some of the last hardened wretches that stand out ; that this is the last call that ever they are likely to hear ; that they are now hanging over the pit of destruction, and just ready this moment to fall into it ; that hell fire now flashes into their faces, and that the devil now stands ready to sieze upon them and carry them to hell ; and that they will oftentimes repeat the awful words ‘Damned ! Damned ! Damned !’ three or four times over.”¹

The reader will pardon another quotation from Tracy’s “The Great Awakening,” a work full of accounts of the tireless efforts of a band of sincere, but deluded men, to shatter the minds and hearts of men in order to bring them to God.

Rev. Jonathan Parsons describes the effects which one of his sermons produced on his hearers. “Under this sermon, many had their countenances changed ; their thoughts seemed to trouble them, so that the joints of their loins were loosed, and their knees smote one against another. Great numbers cried out aloud in the anguish of their souls. Several stout men fell as though a cannon had been discharged, and a ball had made its way through their hearts. Some young women were thrown into hysterical fits. The sight and noise of lamentations seemed a little resemblance of what we may imagine will be when the great Judge pronounces the tremendous sentence of ‘go, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.’ There were so many in distress, that I could not get a particular knowledge of the special reasons at that time, only as I heard them crying, ‘Woe is me ! What must I do?’ and such sort of short sentences with bitter accents.”²

The above work must be read through in order to gain an adequate conception of the frequency with which such sermons were preached, and the wide extent of their baneful influence.

Even in our own day we are told that, “When Mr. Moody was holding his meetings in Manchester, he found a popular feeling strong enough to support his wildest utterances. The crowd seemed to gloat on his horrors to an extent which encouraged him in his strange extravagances. He had heard of a lady who had prevented her daughter from going to his enquiry meeting, and to a vast crowd in Free Trade Hall he depicted that lady and her daughter in hell undergoing pun-

¹ Quoted by S. P. Hayes: *Amer. Jour. Psy.*, Vol. 13, No. 4.

² P. 138.

ishments so foul and frightful—depicted this in such gross and vulgar language—that none but an audience paralyzed by superstition would have tolerated it for a moment.”¹

It is pleasing to note that when Alexander Dowie or Elijah III fired a volley of billingsgate at his audience in Madison Square Garden recently, he was hooted and jeered, and finally forced to leave the platform.

It is hardly necessary to remark that many of the above phenomena are due to the subtle influences of imitation, suggestion, hypnotism, emotional contagion, etc., which are always at play in a psychological crowd, and which rob the individuals of their rational control over themselves and reduce them to the level of the lower animals whose acts are instinctive and reflexive.² Some one suddenly cries out, throws up his hands, or falls down in a fit, then others of a neurotic temperament become infected, and soon the whole congregation is thrown into a terrible confusion. We shall see many cases of this in the

KENTUCKY REVIVAL.

Still more pathological were the phenomena which attended the great revival which spread with lightning-like rapidity over Kentucky, Tennessee, and adjoining States in 1800. The conditions here in the pioneer days were most primitive and immoral, and the region was aptly called ‘Satan’s stronghold.’ Men lived with their wives and children in log cabins constructed in a day, and spent most of their time drinking, gambling, duelling, brutal fighting, gouging, and in other vicious pastimes.” “A Kentuc” in 1800 had much the same meaning that a “cowboy” has now. He was the most reckless, fearless, law-despising of men. A common description of him was “half horse, half alligator, tipped with snapping-turtle.” Suddenly these same people underwent a marvellous and unparalleled moral regeneration.

The following is a brief and interesting account of this remarkable revival. “Two young men began the great work in the summer of 1799. They were brothers, preachers, and on their way across the pine barrens to Ohio, but turned aside to be present at a sacramental solemnity on Red River. The people were accustomed to gather at such times on a

¹ M. D. Conway: *Idols and Ideals*, p. 33.

² See Davenport: *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals, passim*.

Friday, and, by praying, singing, and hearing sermons, prepare themselves for the reception of the sacrament on Sunday. At the Red River meeting the brothers were asked to preach, and one did so with astonishing fervor. As he spoke, the people were deeply moved, tears ran streaming down their faces, and one, a woman far in the rear of the house, broke through order and began to shout. For two hours after the regular preachers had gone the crowd lingered, and were loath to depart. While they tarried, one of the brothers was irresistibly impelled to speak. He rose and told them that he felt called to preach; that he could not be silent. The words which then fell from his lips roused the people before him "to a pungent sense of sin." Again and again the woman shouted, and would not be silent. He started to go to her. The crowd begged him to turn back. Something within him urged him on, and he went through the house shouting and exhorting and praising God. In a moment the floor, to use his own words, "was covered with the slain." Their cries for mercy were terrible to hear. Some found forgiveness, but many went away "spiritually wounded" and suffering unutterable agony of soul.

Nothing could allay the excitement. Every settlement along the Green River and the Cumberland was full of religious fervor. Men fitted their wagons with beds and provisions, and travelled fifty miles to camp upon the ground and hear him preach. The idea was new; hundreds adopted it, and camp-meetings began. There was now no longer any excuse to stay away from preaching. Neither distance, nor lack of houses, nor scarcity of food, nor daily occupations prevailed. Led by curiosity, by excitement, by religious zeal, families of every Protestant denomination—Baptist, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalian—hurried to the camp-ground. Crops were left half gathered; every kind of work was left undone; cabins were deserted; in large settlements there did not remain one soul. The first regular general camp-meeting was held at the Gasper River Church, in July, 1800; but the rage spread, and a dozen encampments followed in quick succession. Camp-meeting was always in the forest near some little church, which served as the preacher's lodge. At one end of a clearing was a rude stage, and before it the stumps and trunks of hewn trees, on which the listeners sat. About the clearing were the tents and wagons ranged in rows like streets. The praying, the preaching, the

exhorting would sometimes last for seven days, and be prolonged every day until darkness had begun to give way to light. Nor were the ministers the only exhortors. Men and women, nay, even children, took part. At Cane Ridge a little girl of seven sat upon the shoulder of a man and preached to the multitude till she sank exhausted on the bearer's head. At Indian Creek a lad of twelve mounted a stump and exhorted till he grew weak, whereupon two men upheld him, and he continued until speech was impossible. A score of sinners fell prostrate before him.

At no time was the "falling exercise" so prevalent as at night. Nothing was then wanting that could strike terror into minds weak, timid, and harassed. The red glare of the camp-fires reflected from hundreds of tents and wagons; the dense blackness of the flickering shadows, the darkness of the surrounding forest, made still more terrible by the groans and screams of the "spiritually wounded," who had fled to it for comfort; the entreaty of the preachers; the sobs and shrieks of the downcast still walking through the dark valley of the Shadow of Death; the shouts and songs of praise from the happy ones who had crossed the delectable Mountains, had gone on through the fogs of the Enchanted Ground and entered the land of Beulah, were too much for those over whose minds and bodies lively imaginations held full sway. The heart swelled, the nerves gave way, the hands and feet grew cold and, motionless and speechless, they fell headlong to the ground. In a moment crowds gathered about them to pray and shout. Some lay still as death. Some passed through frightful twitchings of face and limb. At Cabin Creek so many fell that, lest the multitude should tread on them, they were carried to the meeting-house and laid in rows on the floor. At Cane Ridge the number was three thousand. . . . Every road that led to the ground is described to have presented for several days an almost unbroken line of wagons, horses, and men. . . . It is estimated that twenty thousand encamped at the Cane Ridge meeting. The excitement surpassed anything that had been known. Men who came to scoff remained to preach. All day and all night the crowd swarmed to and fro from preacher to preacher singing, shouting, laughing, now rushing off to some new exhorter who had climbed upon a stump, now gathering around some unfortunate who, in their peculiar language, was "spiritually slain." Soon men and women fell in such numbers that it

became impossible for the multitude to move about without trampling them, and they were hurried to the meeting-house. At no time was the floor less than half covered. Some talked, but could not move. Some beat the floor with their heels. Some, shrieking in agony, bounded about, it is said, like a live fish out of water. Many lay down and rolled over and over for hours at a time. Others rushed wildly over the stumps and benches, and then plunged, shouting, *Lost! Lost!* into the forest.

As the meetings grew more and more frequent, this nervous excitement assumed new and more terrible forms. One was known as jerking; another as the barking exercise; a third, as the Holy Laugh. "The jerks" began in the head and spread rapidly to the feet. The head would be thrown from side to side so swiftly that the features would be blotted out and the hair made to snap. When the body was affected, the sufferer was hurled over hindrances that came in his way, and finally dashed on the ground to bounce about like a ball. At camp-meeting in the far South, saplings were cut off breast-high and left "for the people to jerk by." One who visited such a camp-ground declares that about the roots of from fifty to one hundred saplings the earth was kicked up "as by a horse stamping flies." The community seemed demented. From the nerves and muscles the disorder passed to the mind. Men dreamed dreams and saw visions, nay, fancied themselves dogs, went down on all fours, and barked till they grew hoarse. It was no uncommon sight to behold numbers of them gathered about a tree, barking, yelping, "treeing the devil." Two years later, when much of the excitement of the great revival had gone down, falling and jerking gave way to hysterics. During the most earnest preaching and exhorting, even sincere professors of religion would, on a sudden, burst into loud laughter; others, unable to resist, would follow, and soon the assembled multitude would join in. This was the "Holy Laugh," and became, after 1803, a recognized part of worship.¹

Strikingly close parallels to these cases are to be found in missionary reports of conversion to Christianity among primitive and non-Christian peoples. Bishop Calloway² describes violent attacks suffered by the negroes in Natal after their

¹ McMaster: *Hist. of the People of U. S.*, Vol. 2, pp. 578-582.

² *Jour. Anthropol. Soc.*, Vol. 1, p. 171.

conversion; Brough Smith¹ describes similar attacks among native Australian converts; Rev. Nevius² those of Chinese converts; and James Mooney³ those of the Sioux Indians during their Ghost Dance outbreak in 1890.

JUMPERS.

Jumping is a characteristic of several extravagant religious sects. About 1740 a religious sect known as the Jumpers arose in Wales. Their performances resembled closely an Indian Ghost Dance. The following is an account of their method of worship. "After the preaching was over any one who pleased gave out a verse of a hymn, and this they sung over and over again with all their might and main, thirty or forty times, till some of them worked themselves into a sort of drunkenness or madness; they were then violently agitated and leaped up and down in all manner of postures, frequently for hours together." A similar sect known as Shakers arose in England about 1750. The founder and chief prophetess of this sect was 'Mother' Ann Lee, who was regarded by her followers as the reincarnation of Christ. Their services were described by one of their own number as follows: "Sometimes after sitting awhile in silent meditation they were seized with a mighty trembling, under which they would often express the indignation of God against all sin. At other times they were exercised with singing, shouting, and leaping for joy at the near prospect of salvation. They were often exercised with great agitation of the body and limbs, shaking, running, and walking the floor, with a variety of other operations and signs, swiftly passing and repassing each other like clouds agitated with a mighty wind."⁴

Under the influence of Wesley and Whitefield all sorts of hysterical and convulsive phenomena like those which obtained in the New England and Kentucky revivals were seen at the meetings of the early English Methodists.⁵ About twenty-five years ago there appeared in Russia a new religious sect which received the name Prygouny or Jumpers. Their principal dogma was that the Holy Spirit descends upon the believers. The Holy Spirit, however, does not descend on all,

¹ The Aborigines of Victoria, Vol. 1, p. 466.

² Demon Possession, *passim*.

³ Bureau of Ethnology, 14th Annual Report, 1890.

⁴ Jas. Mooney: *op. cit.*

⁵ See Davenport: Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals, pp. 133-179.

for in each assembly there are only two or three who are so favored. The visible signs of His presence are, first of all, an extraordinary paleness of the face, an accelerated respiration, then a rocking of the whole body. As soon as this is noticed the worshippers begin to stamp in time, going in a direction opposite to the course of the sun ; then jumping and terrible contortions begin and continue until they finally fall exhausted upon the ground.¹

Several Islamic sects among whom such practices obtain have been described by M. Zambaco,² but these, as well as the few immediately preceding, do not properly belong under the caption of Fear.

THE CONVERSION OF CHILDREN.

Far more unhappy and culpable are the attempts to frighten children into accepting a religion for which their years and reason are far too unripe. It is as impossible for mere infants, so to speak, to grasp and understand the truths of the most highly developed religion, as it is for them to understand the truths of science, and any attempt to force or coax them to do so are, to say the very least, unpedagogic and absurd. As well attempt to make them think the thoughts and wear the clothes of adults. "The mind grows as the body does," said Aristotle, "by taking proper nourishment, not by being stretched on the rack." The child, in its development, hastily recapitulates that of the race, it is true, but it cannot do so at one bound. There are untold centuries between the lowest and highest forms of religion. At first, the child will, perhaps, be an animist and fetichist, then, perhaps, a polytheist, then a deist, and only in the later years of adolescence has he attained the mental and moral development sufficient to assimilate and appreciate modern Christianity.³

It is much to be regretted, therefore, that attempts, like those of Rev. E. Payson Hammond, the 'Children's Evangelist,' to force Edwardian Christianity into the minds and hearts of little children, are not only permitted but endorsed and lauded by many ministers throughout the land. We venture to say that no individual in recent times has under-

¹ Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire*, pp. 118-135.

² *Des Exaltations Religieuses en Orient*, Progress Med., Paris, 1884.
³ See Jean du Buy: *Stages of Religious Development*, *Amer. Jour. of Religious Psy.* and Ed., May, 1904.

mined the mental and physical health of more children than has this so-called servant of God.

A few quotations from his writings must suffice to show the nature of his work and its results. "When I spoke to you last," writes a little girl, "I could not say Jesus is mine; and I cannot yet. I attended the inquiry meeting last Sunday, and three ladies talked to me. By-and-by a little girl came and asked me if I had found Jesus. I could not answer her, for I began to weep."

"Oh, Mr. Hammond, I am so unhappy! I have tried to find Jesus, but I cannot. Please pray for me that I may soon be happy, working for Jesus. From your loving little friend,
"ROSA."¹

This is one of many hundred similar letters which Rev. Hammond boasts he has received.

"I began to talk to this little girl who had been engaged in prayer," writes Rev. Dr. Alexander, Hammond's co-laborer, "and I said to her, after I had reassured her a little, 'Well now, I heard you thanking God for pardoning your sins, and for the peace of mind you have; I suppose you feel that you have been converted.' And she said, 'Yes sir,' with great quietness, and great assurance of mind. I said, 'Now how did that come to pass? You did not always think of these things.' 'Oh no!' she said, 'I never cared about them at all.' 'Well,' I said, 'just tell me how it came to pass that you did come to care about them.' She said, 'I came to the meetings, and attended them for awhile; but I did not care much about what was going on. One night I went, with some others, into a room. There were a good many women there, and some of them were greetin' about their sins. A lady was present who spoke to them, told them about their sins, and told them how they were to get pardon; and,' she added, in her simple sort of way, 'the thought just came into my mind that I was a sinner too.' I said, 'And did you go away with that thought?' 'Yes,' she replied. I said, 'Did that grieve you?' Looking up in my face with a most earnest and striking expression, she said, 'Eh, sir, I was in an awfu' way.' In this state she continued, she said, for a good while. I asked, 'How did you find peace of mind?' 'Oh, sir,' she replied, 'it was something that Mr. Hammond said when he was

¹ *Early Conversion*, p. 120.

preaching.' I asked, 'What gave you peace of mind?' Turning on me again the same intense and earnest look, she exclaimed, 'Oh, there is nothing *can* give peace of mind to the sinner but the blood that was shed on Calvary.' . . . I may just mention, that as this talk was going on, there was a little boy in the corner of the room, so little a fellow that he had just emerged from the condition of petticoats, and had not reached the dignity of a jacket; his whole costume being in one piece from his neck to the heels. He was standing in the corner of the room and sobbing very hard. The only idea that came into my mind was that the little fellow was sleepy, and that he wanted to go home, as it was now about ten o'clock. I said to one of the little girls that he was wearied, and that some one had better take him home. She said, 'Oh, no, sir; he is not weary, he is greetin' about his sins.' I went to the little fellow, and I spoke to him; however, he was really past speaking to. He was in a state of great distress, whatever was the cause. I said to one of the girls, 'Perhaps you could speak to him better than I could;' and she replied, 'Well, yes, sir; I will speak to him, but he does not belong to this place.' I said, 'Indeed!' 'No, puir fellow; he has walked all the way frae Prestonpans to-night.' Now this was a dark, wintry night, and yet this little creature had walked, by himself, about four miles, to get to the meeting. I asked about him the last time I was out. This little girl told me that she believed he was going on in the right way."¹ Again, "A few days ago I found a little boy about eight years of age, in one of these seats at the children's inquiry meeting, sobbing aloud. Said I, 'What's the matter, my dear little fellow?' 'Oh, dear! I'm lost! I'm lost! and I can't find Jesus! O! my wicked heart! How can I get a new heart? I have been so wicked! I have never loved Jesus at all! I thought I loved Him, but I know I never did. Will He take me?'"²

It is fear, which, perhaps more than anything else, has led men to build altars, offer sacrifices, and worship fetiches, or objects believed to have the power of placating the spirits and warding off evil.

Oldentfield, writing of the Aborigines of Australia says, "The number of supernatural beings feared if not loved, that they acknowledge is exceedingly great; for not only are the

¹ *The Conversion of Children*, pp. 8-9.

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

heavens peopled with such, but the whole face of the country swarms with them ; every thicket, most watering places and all rocky places abound with evil spirits. In like manner, every natural phenomenon is believed to be the work of demons, none of which seem of a benign nature, one and all apparently striving to do all imaginable mischief to the poor black fellow.''¹

The following prayer of the Madagascans is interesting :

“ O Zamhor ! to thee we offer no prayers. The good god needs no asking. But we must pray to Nyang. Nyang must be appeased. O Nyang, bad and strong spirit, let not the thunder roar over our heads ! Tell the sea to keep within its bounds ! Spare, O Nyang, the ripening fruit, and dry not up the blossoming rice ! Let not our women bring forth children on the accursed days. Thou reignest, and this thou knowest, over the wicked ; and great is their number, O Nyang, torment not, then, any longer the good folk ! ”²

A century ago Kien Lung, Emperor of China, made the following vow to one of the Fire-gods of Peking, who was believed to have been the cause of the destruction by fire of his most favorite building, the Hall of Contemplation :

“ O Fire-god, thou hast been wroth with me in that I have built me palaces, and left thy shrine unhonored and in ruins. Here I do vow to build thee a temple surpassed by none other of the Fire-gods in Peking ; but I shall expect thee in the future not to meddle with my palaces.”³

Plant and animal sacrifices were offered by all ancient, savage and civilized peoples. But when calamities were threatening, such gifts were not deemed sufficiently great for the malignant gods. They demanded the very best that man could offer, namely, human flesh and blood, the sons and daughters of kings and princes, innocent babes and virgins, or at least slaves and captives taken in war. This brings us to a consideration of the most revolting and sanguinary deeds ever perpetrated by human beings.

HUMAN SACRIFICES.

It is difficult to believe that such an unnatural and pernicious practice was almost universal in its scope, and yet, that such was the case will be seen from the following citations.

¹ Trans. Eth. Soc., Vol. 3, p. 228.

² Reville: The Devil, p. 6. ³ M. D. Conway: Idols and Ideals, p. 73.

The ancient Egyptian kings offered human sacrifices at the tomb of Osiris. In the temple at Heliopolis, three human beings were daily burnt, according to Manethon, as a sacrifice to Typhon, until the reign of Amasis. In Phoenicia, when the people suffered great calamities from war, or pestilence, or drought, they chose by public vote the one most dear to them and sacrificed him to Saturn. A similar custom prevailed among the Rhodians, Curetes, Carthaginians, and the Sardi, according to Suidas. The Carthaginians, Klitarch tells us, carried this brutal custom to such an extreme that those who were childless bought children of their poor neighbors for the purpose of sacrificing them. Likewise, Diodorus, in narrating the expedition of Agathocles against the Carthaginians says, "They gave just cause likewise to their god Saturn to be their enemy; for in former times they used to sacrifice to this god the sons of the most eminent persons, but of late times they secretly bought and bred up children for that purpose; and upon strict search being made, there were found, amongst them that were to be sacrificed, some children that had been changed and put in the place of others. Weighing these things in their minds, and now seeing that the enemy lay before their walls, they were seized with such a pang of superstition, as if they had utterly forsaken the religion of their fathers. That they might therefore without delay reform what was amiss, they offered as a public sacrifice 200 of the sons of the nobility, and no fewer than 300 more (who were liable to censure) voluntarily offered themselves up; for among the Carthaginians there was a brazen statue of Saturn, putting forth the palms of his hands bending in such a manner towards the earth, as the boy who was laid upon them in order to be sacrificed, should slip off and so fall down headlong into a deep fiery furnace."

There is the testimony of both Herodotus and Photius that the Persians practiced human sacrifice, and buried men, women, and children to appease the wrath of Mithra.

The Arabs, as late as Mohammed's time, sacrificed a nursing every seventh day to Moloch, and every Thursday to Jupiter. Mohammed states that his father was doomed to be sacrificed but purchased his ransom with 100 camels. Burying alive was also quite a common practice among them.

At the time of the migration of the Israelites from Egypt (circa, 1320 B. C.) all of the tribes occupying the land of

Canaan, as well as the Amalekites, Midianites, and Moabites, whose territories they traversed, were worshippers of the sun-god in some of his forms. And whether their tribal god was appealed to as Baal, Chemosh, Milcolm, Ashtoreth or Moloch, it was the same deity only under a different aspect.

The sun was a source of light, and warmth, and life, and all good, but not always was the sun a beneficent, life-giving deity, whose genial beams fructified the receptive earth, and nourished and sustained all animate nature. At times he became jealous and angry, and then he was a cruel and bloodthirsty monster, whose fierce heat withered the fruits and grain, drank up the water in the rivers and fountains, consumed the blood in the veins of man and beast, and spread famine and pestilence throughout the whole land. Then instead of being worshipped with offerings of fruits and flowers, and festive songs and dances, his altars were glutted with the blood of human victims poured out to appease his anger. Instances of human sacrifices among the Canaanites, and many others, are very frequently mentioned in the Old Testament.¹

In 2 Kings 3 : 26-27, we have a case of vicarious sacrifice, a practice common among many primitive and ancient peoples, and of which, according to Christian belief, Christ was the greatest victim. Moses proffered his life for the Israelites; David delivered the sons of Saul to be sacrificed for the sins of their father, and during Titus's siege of Jerusalem, a distinguished Jewess, according to Josephus, slaughtered her own child as a sacrifice. In the Cabalistic work 'Sohar,' it is written that the death of an innocent atones for the sins of the world, and even Origen believed that in times of a national calamity, the voluntary death of a pious man could appease the divinity.

In Exod. 32 : 27-29, God himself commands Moses to order a general slaughter among Israel, and as a result, three thousand men fell in one day. Again, in Num. 25 : 4, 5, we read : "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel."

When Joshua sacked Jericho he "utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword."

¹ Lev. 18 : 21 ; 20 : 2-5. Deut. 12 : 31.

Only after he had stoned Achan was "the Lord turned from the fierceness of his anger."

Samuel, after rebuking Saul for his disobedience and humanness, "hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal."

Jephthah sacrificed his daughter because of a rash vow made to God. Manasseh made his sons pass through the fire, and in (Ps. 106: 37-38,) and (Jer. 7: 31,) we are told that the children of Israel sacrificed their sons and daughters unto the heathen gods.

These instances will suffice to show that offering human sacrifices was by no means unknown to the ancient Jews.

When we come to the Greeks and Romans we find the same thing true of them. At the obsequies of Patroclus, Achilles sacrificed horses, oxen, sheep, dogs, and human beings to the manes of the deceased.¹ Idomeneus, king of Crete, sacrificed his son; and Agamemnon, to appease the anger of the wrathful Artemis, attempted to sacrifice his daughter, Iphigenia. Polyxena, daughter of King Priam, was sacrificed to appease the wrathful shade of Achilles,² as were the two daughters of Orion, king of Thebes, to avert the anger of their god, and stop the ravages of a plague that was devastating his city.³ Human sacrifices were frequently offered to Dionysius in Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos, Arcadia, and Boetia. Herodotus relates, that Menelaus, after he had brought Helen safely home, sacrificed two native boys to the favorable wind. Aristodemus, king of the Messinians, sacrificed 300 men to Zeus. In Athens and other cities paupers and culprits were fattened, and then slaughtered as expiatory sacrifices. Among the Romans this brutal practice was in use from the earliest times until long after the Christian era. After the disastrous battle of Cumae (B. C. 216) by authority of the sacred books, a Greek man and woman, and a man and woman of Gaul, were sacrificed in the market place at Rome to appease the anger of the gods.⁴

The Tarquinians slaughtered three hundred Roman captives as a sacrifice. In Latium, Saturn was honored with human sacrifices. According to Sallust, Cataline and his conspirators sacrificed and ate a youth and drank his blood

¹ Iliad, Bk. 23, 205 ff.

² Ovid : Metamorphosis, Bk. 23, 439.

³ Ovid : Metamorphosis, Bk. 12, 487 ff.

⁴ Livy: Bk. 28, ch. 51.

with wine in order to strengthen their oath. Herodotus tells of a similar practice among the Lydians, Medes, and Babylonians; and Tacitus among the Armenians. Pliny records that in the year of the city 657 (B. C. 97) a decree forbidding human sacrifice was passed by the Senate; from which time the practice ceased in public, and for some time altogether.¹ According to Macrobius, human sacrifices were offered at Rome down to the time of Brutus (B. C. 44), who abolished them upon the establishment of the republic. But long after this time the rite was resorted to in exceptional cases to propitiate the gods; for it is an historic fact that in the time of Augustus, 100 knights were sacrificed by his orders at Perusia; and as late as A. D. 270 a similar immolation occurred in the time of the Emperor Aurelian. Nero, frightened by a comet, offered human sacrifices. Heliogabal had the children of the most distinguished families in all Italy gathered together in order to sacrifice them in the Syrian Mysteries; and the Church-Fathers assure us that human sacrifices were offered at Rome to Jupiter latialis in the 4th cent. A. D. The ancient Germans, Gauls, the Dacians, Scythians, Caledonians, Celts, Goths, the ancient Prussians, and others, — all, according to the best authorities, propitiated their angry gods in the same sanguinary manner.²

In some parts of India, the custom has survived almost to our own day. Among the Khonds of Orissa, one of the ancient kingdoms of Hindustan, human sacrifices were constantly practiced up to the year 1836, when the attention of the British government, having been directed to it by one of its agents, took the most strenuous means to break it up.³

In 1866, the press reported a terrible public sacrifice in Dahomey in which the king had 200 victims slaughtered in order to win the favor of the gods in the war which he was about to wage against the Aschantis. This was the third atrocity of the kind in the same year. In Kumassi there is a place always wet with human blood.

Prescott writes concerning the Aztecs, “Human sacrifices have been practiced by many nations, not excepting the most polished nations of antiquity, but never by any on a scale to be compared to those in Anahuac. The amount of victims

¹ Pliny: Bk. 30, ch. 3.

² Tacitus: *Manners of the Germans*, chs. 9-39; *Annals* Bk. 14, ch. 31. Pliny, Bk. 7, ch. 2; Davies, *British Druids*, pp. 462-466.

³ Lieut. McPherson: *Trans. Asiatic Soc.*, 1841.

immolated on its accursed altars would stagger the faith of the least scrupulous believer.”¹ Scarcely any author pretends to estimate the yearly sacrifices throughout the empire at less than 20,000 and some carry the number as high as 50,000.

Their mode of sacrificing, as described by Biart, shows a diabolie cruelty, unparalleled by that of any other people. “Once in possession of a victim, these executioners (the priests) carried him naked to a grand altar (techcatl), on which they extended him, having first indicated to the assistants the idol to which they were about to offer sacrifice, so that they might adore it. Four of the priests then held the unhappy being still by the legs and arms, while another kept him from moving his head with the aid of an instrument of wood or stone, made in the form of a horseshoe, and sometimes representing a curved serpent. The stone of the altar being convex, the body was bent in an arch, with the breast and stomach prominent, and the victim could make no resistance. The Topiltzin (chief priest) then approached, and, with a knife of jasper or chalcedony, in accordance with the rite, opened the breast of the prisoner, tore out his heart, offered it palpitating to the sun, and then threw it to the feet of the idol to burn it and contemplate its ashes with veneration. If the idol was large and hollow, they placed the bleeding heart in its mouth with the aid of a golden spoon, and daubed its lips with the blood. When the victim was a prisoner-of-war they cut off his head to preserve it for the Tzompatli, and the body was then thrown on the lower step of the temple. There the officer or soldier who had captured him seized the prey, carried it away, had it cooked and served to his friends at a banquet. They ate only the thighs, the arms and the breast. As to the trunk, it was reduced to ashes, or given as food to the animals of the royal menagerie. The Otomites quartered the victim, and sold the remains in the market. Among the Zapotecs, men were sacrificed to the gods, women to the goddesses, and children to the inferior deities.”²

Tylor mentions many instances of the ancient custom of propitiating the deity by the immolation of human victims upon the founding of a city. “So late as 1843, in Germany, when a new bridge was built at Halle, a notion was abroad among the people that a child was wanted to be built into

¹ Conquest of Mexico, Vol. 1, ch. 3.

² The Aztecs, pp. 162-163.

the foundation.’’¹ The wall of Copenhagen, legend says, sank as fast as it was built; so they took an innocent little girl, set her on a chair at a table with toys and eatables, and, as she played and ate, twelve master masons closed a vault over her; then, with clang ing music, the wall was raised, and stood firm ever after.’’²

Similar rites were practiced throughout Europe, and among many of the Asiatic and African peoples. Joshua evidently refers to this custom when he says, ‘‘Cursed be the man that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho: he shall lay the foundation thereof in his firstborn, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it.’’

Instances of human sacrifices might be multiplied almost *ad infinitum*, but our list is already too long.

The above consideration of the pathological effects resulting from an abnormal relation of the different emotions to the total religious experience justifies, in the opinion of the writer, the following generalizations.

First. Religion, like all other human products, such as art, science, philosophy, government, etc., is subject to the laws of evolution and degeneration, and is modified and colored by the general state of mental and physical health and degree of development of the individuals composing a tribe or race. Different types of individuals and different eras must of necessity give birth to different types of religion. God or nature has created a variety of types of individuals and each type has created a God in its own image.

Second. The religion of a people can never rise above its source, *i. e.*, the stage of their mental and moral development. The religion of a religious genius, though it may be accepted by the masses is rarely, if ever, their own religion in the truest sense of the word. Our meaning will be made clear when we say that after a lapse of twenty centuries of unparalleled development there are but few Christians even to-day. Also, the difference between the Christianity of the third century and of the twentieth is proportional to the difference in the mental and moral development of the two centuries. Likewise, the religion of the savage and of the child of civilized parents is and always must be inferior to that of

¹ Primitive Culture, Vol. 1, pp. 104-110.

² I am indebted for the majority of the above references to Schaaffhausen, *Anthropolog. Studien.*; and W. H. Gardner, *Human Sacrifices*, Open Court, Vol. 8, pp. 3991 ff. and 4000 ff.

the cultured adult. It is as impossible to make them suddenly rise to the heights of a religion which has taken the most progressive nations centuries upon centuries to evolve as it is to hasten the growth of a tree by pulling it up. All attempts to do so have proven most injurious to the mental and physical health of the savage and the child. The true pedagogical method, so long ago recognized and put in use by the Buddhists, and the first great and successful missionary, St. Paul¹ is, it is encouraging to note, at last being more and more appreciated by our own religious teachers and missionaries, who are now endeavoring to teach the child and the primitive peoples religions which they can understand and readily assimilate, religions which fit their stages of development and satisfy their needs.

Third. A religion cannot be judged by its theology alone, for while beliefs undoubtedly influence conduct they are themselves frequently products of conduct, *i. e.*, explanations and justifications of conduct, and conduct itself is merely an outward expression of deep-lying emotions, tendencies, habits, and instincts which the interplay of countless physical, physiological, and psychical factors have evolved through the ages. In order, therefore, to understand the religion of an individual or a race it is not sufficient to know his or its creed; we must know the whole story of his or its life and environment, past and present.

Fourth. Arrested peoples have naturally enough arrested forms of religion. These religions cannot be called superstitions because superstitions, as we understand them, are unknown to these peoples. Their beliefs and practices, absurd and childish as they seem to us, are congruous with their stage of development and are as truly religious as are those of more advanced peoples. Unless they injure the mental, moral, and physical health of their adherents they cannot be considered pathological. But when these same beliefs and customs persist among a people who have reached a stage of development which is not compatible with them, they become, like rudimentary organs, useless and dangerous.

Fifth. We have seen to what a large extent religion draws upon the emotions. Indeed, in the light of what has preceded we have no hesitancy in saying with Jonathan Edwards that true religion consists so much in the affections

¹ See 1 Cor. 3:1-2.

that there can be no true religion without them. One may be a philosopher, critic, and even a theologian and still be non-religious; and on the other hand he may be none of these to any marked degree and be extremely religious. "And though I have the gift of prophecy," says Paul, "and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity (love, kindness, sympathy, pity, etc.), I am nothing."¹ At least, so far as religion is concerned. It is "out of his strongest feelings," as Mr. Fielding writes, that "man has built up his faiths,"² and a cold intellectual religion is an anomaly.

Sixth. While the emotions are a prime essential of religion, as rivers are of fruitful valleys, and while in every normal religious consciousness each has its own proper and harmonious expression, the most disastrous results follow whenever any of them is inordinately exaggerated or intensified; whenever the river, so to speak, overflows its banks and spreads over alien areas. The danger here is especially great because of the close connection between the emotions and bodily states. It is impossible, of course, to determine with mathematical accuracy beyond what point the expression of an emotion becomes abnormal; the gradations from the normal to the abnormal are imperceptible. In the above cases, however, there can be no doubt that the phenomena are positively pathological, for in every instance the intellectual, moral, or physical development of the individual, the tribe, or the race has been seriously interfered with.

Lastly, we have seen the close relationship between the emotions and conduct. Disordered religious emotions lead to grotesque and pathological deeds, and *vice versa*. This is especially true when the individual is a member of a crowd. Man is an organism, no part of which can be injured or deranged without its influencing other parts and the whole. In religion, as in all things, 'sophrosune,' or the harmonious subordination of the parts to the whole, is the healthy and normal condition to be striven for. Narrowness, onesidedness, crystallization, bigotry, fanaticism, and intolerance, these have always been the curses of humanity. Modern education, secular as well as religious, has still much to learn from the ancient Greeks who considered 'sophrosune' or

¹ 1 Cor. 13:2.

² *The Hearts of Men*, p. 308.

plasticity, the foundation of every virtue, and its mission will never be fulfilled until it has taught men to be temperate and plastic in all things. For the temperate man is pre-eminently the normal man; in his soul and body divine harmony reigns. He is healthy and happy, moral, religious, and worldly, he grows and readily adapts himself to new ideas and conditions, in a word, he is the *Übermensch* for whom are the kingdoms of Heaven and Earth.

CHAPTER III.

MYSTICISM.

Mysticism, like religion, is a term which has almost as many different definitions as it has definers. We look in vain for agreement as to its meaning. Some consider it the product of a diseased brain, or gross ignorance; others as divine inspiration, or intuition; some find its seat in subconsciousness or the Unconscious, others regard it as the highest flight of human reason; some define it in terms of will, desire, tendency; others in terms of feeling and emotion, and not a few make it a compound of all psychic activities. A few examples will substantiate this:

Nordau: "The word *Mysticism* describes a state of mind in which the subject imagines that he perceives or divines unknown and inexplicable relations among phenomena, discerns in things hints at mysteries, and regards them as symbols by which a dark power seeks to unveil, or at least to indicate, all sorts of marvels. . . . It is always connected with strong emotional excitement."

Mysticism, he tells us, is so characteristic of degeneration, that "there is scarcely a case of the latter in which mysticism does not appear." He agrees with Legrain, whom he quotes, that "Mystical thoughts are to be laid to the account of the insanity of the degenerate. There are two states in which they are observed—in epilepsy and in hysterical delirium."

R. A. Vaughan: "Mysticism is that form of error which mistakes for a Divine manifestation the operations of a merely human faculty." In another place he defines it as "the romance of religion."

Mill: "Mysticism is neither more nor less than ascribing objective existence to the subjective creations of the mind, and believing that by watching and contemplating these ideas of its own making, it can read what takes place in the world without."

Bonchitté: "Mysticism consists in giving to the spon-

taneity of the intelligence a larger part than to the other faculties."

Noack: "Mysticism is formless speculation."

Harnack: "Mysticism is rationalism applied to a sphere above reason."

Victor Cousin: "Mysticism consists in substituting direct inspiration for indirect, ecstasy for reason, rapture for philosophy."

Von Hartmann: "Mysticism is the filling of the consciousness with a content (feeling, thought, desire), by an involuntary emergence of the same out of the unconscious."

Récéjac: "Mysticism is the tendency to approach the Absolute morally and by means of symbols."

Inge: "Religious Mysticism may be defined as the attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and in nature, or, more generally, as the *attempt to realize, in thought and feeling, the immanence of the temporal in the eternal, and of the eternal in the temporal.*"

Ewald: "Mystical theology begins by maintaining that man is fallen away from God, and craves to be again united with Him."

Pfleiderer: "Mysticism is the immediate feeling of the unity of the self with God; it is nothing, therefore, but the fundamental feeling of religion, the religious life at its very heart and centre. But what makes the mystical a special tendency inside religion, is the endeavor to fix the immediateness of the life in God as such, as abstracted from all intervening helps and channels whatever, and find a permanent abode in the abstract inwardness of the life of pious feeling. In this God-intoxication, in which self and the world are alike forgotten, the subject knows himself to be in possession of the highest and fullest truth; but this truth is only possessed in the quite undeveloped, simple, and bare form of monotonous feeling; what truth the subject possesses is not filled up by any determination in which the simple unity might unfold itself, and it lacks, therefore, the clearness of knowledge, which is only attained when thought harmonizes differences with unity."

Goethe: "Mysticism is the scholastic of the heart, the dialectic of the feelings."

Prof. A. Seth: "Mysticism is a phase of thought, or rather perhaps, of feeling, which from its very nature is hardly susceptible of exact definition. It appears in connec-

tion with the endeavor of the human mind to grasp the Divine essence, or the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the highest. The first is the philosophic side of Mysticism ; the second, its religious side. The thought that is most intensely present with the mystic is that of a supreme, all-pervading and indwelling Power, in whom all things are one. Hence the speculative utterances of Mysticism are always more or less pantheistic in character. On the practical side, Mysticism maintains the possibility of direct intercourse with this Being of beings . . . God ceases to be an object, and becomes an experience."

Baring-Gould does not define Mysticism, but he undertakes to tell us precisely how it is manufactured. His account is one of the curiosities of science, and is a striking illustration of the effect of dilettanteism in science. "Mysticism," he writes, "is produced by the combustion of the gray vascular matter in the sensorium — the thalami optici and the corpora striata. Mysticism may be combined with intellectual action, in which case the gray matter in the cerebral hemispheres undergoes oxidation as well."¹ This is materialism with a vengeance.

The same disagreement is met with when the mystics themselves are under consideration. Bishop Warburton, for instance, declares that, "Behmen's works would disgrace Bedlam at full moon," and John Wesley calls them "sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled." And yet philosophers consider him too important not to be considered in their histories, and some go so far as to say that "the father of Protestant Mysticism perhaps only wanted learning and the gift of clear expression to become a German Plato."²

Sir Isaac Newton secluded himself for three months to study Boehme's views on attraction and the laws of motion, which he considered of great value.

Of our own Walt Whitman, Lombroso says he was a "mad genius." Dr. Nordau gladly concurs with him in the opinion that he was "mad," but that he was a genius: — nothing could be more absurd. On the contrary, "he was a vagabond, a reprobate rake, and his poems contain outbursts of erotomania so artlessly shameless that their parallel in lit-

¹ *Origin and Develop. of Religious Belief*, p. 360.

² Inge: *Christian Mysticism*, p. 278. I am indebted to this writer for most of the above definitions.

erature could hardly be found with the author's name attached." Again, "he is morally insane, and incapable of distinguishing between good and evil, virtue and crime." Prof. James, on the other hand, is, perhaps, one of those "many readers who," he tells us, are "quite willing to admit that in important respects Whitman is of the genuine lineage of the prophets."¹ At any rate, he quotes him as an example of those who have sane religious views, and devotes several pages to him in his chapter entitled "The Religion of Healthy-mindedness."

There is the same diversity of opinion concerning many other mystics and the reasons for it are several.

Some of the writers are prepossessed against mysticism. They have never even remotely experienced it, are unable to understand it, and therefore infer that it must be nonsense, a heresy, or disease of some sort. Some find fault with the writings and personal lives of the mystics they are acquainted with and hastily condemn the whole tribe and their experiences. Mysticism like religion has been judged too often not by its best fruits but by its worst.

Others, on the contrary, have written of mysticism in the highest terms because they have noted mystical experiences in the lives of the greatest characters in history.

Very many have overlooked the fact that mysticism is of several varieties,—religious, philosophic, artistic, spontaneous, and induced, some of which are normal, some abnormal, and the rest on the border line between the two,—and that, therefore, any statement made of one variety does not necessarily hold true of all or any other. As in the case of religion, so here we should speak of mysticisms rather than of mysticism.

Finally, several recent writers have unfortunately employed the term to cover a multitude of modern sins such as Spiritualism, Clairvoyance, Psychic-healing, Magic, etc., which are advertised and retailed at fifty cents per hour by American women with absurd French names and questionable characters. Prof. Munsterberg, for example, in his chapter on *Mysticism in Psychology and Life* deals only with these which are no more forms of mysticism than they are of religion or anything else except humbuggery.

Much confusion will be avoided if the term be restricted to

¹ *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 87.

its historical and legitimate usage, and if care be taken not to make any general sweeping statements concerning mysticism, but to study each variety carefully and judge it on its own merits irrespective of the merits or demerits of the other varieties.

“Mysticism,” writes Vaughan, “has been incorporated in theism, atheism, and pantheism. It has given men gods at every step, and it has denied all deity except self. It has appeared in the loftiest speculation and in the grossest idolatry. It has been associated with the wildest license, and with the most pitiless asceticism. It has driven men out into action, it has dissolved them into ecstasy, it has frozen them to torpor.”¹ That it is frequently born of an abnormal nervous system none deny. But many a plant whose roots are bitter has beautiful and fragrant flowers, while others bear only poisonous weeds. In either case it is by the fruits and not the roots that we judge a tree or plant, and so we should judge mysticism. Only when mysticism is of such a nature as to cause men to become mere idle dreamers and render them unfit for the duties of life can it be said to be pathological. “The true mystic,” writes Ewald, “never withdraws willfully from the business of life, no, not even from the smallest business.”²

Mysticism has appeared in all times and among all peoples. We meet with it in China, India, Persia, in all parts of Continental Europe, in England, and America. The ancient Buddhists and Brahmins, the Greeks, Mohammedans, Christians, Jews, and primitive peoples, the world over, all have their mystics. Indeed, so universal is it, that we may almost say, that wherever there is religion there is mysticism also. Dr. Brinton, speaking of primitive religions says, “The direct communion between the human and the divine mind, between the Man and God, is the one trait shared by the highest as well as the lowest; it is the one proof of authenticity which each proclaims for itself. I shall tell you of religions so crude as to have no temples or altars, no rites or prayers; but I can tell you of none that does not teach the belief of the intercommunion of the spiritual powers and man. Every religion is a Revelation—in the opinion of its votaries. Those which are called the “book religions” depend mainly upon the *record* of a revelation, while in all primitive faiths inspiration is actual and constant.”

¹ Half Hours with Mystics, p. 24.

² Quoted by Inge: Christian Mysticism, p. 10.

Again, "I am not speaking of deceptions or illusions. When I say that all religions depend for their origin and continuance directly upon inspiration, I state an historic fact. It may be known under other names, of credit or discredit, as mysticism, ecstasy, rhapsody, demoniac possession, the divine afflatus, the gnosis, or in its latest christening, 'cosmic consciousness.' All are but expressions of a belief that knowledge arises, words are uttered, or actions performed, not through conscious ideation and reflective purpose, but through the promptings of a power above or beyond the individual mind. Prophets and shamans, evangelists and Indian medicine-men, all claim, and all claim with honesty, to be moved by the god within, the 'deus in nobis,' and to speak the words of the Lord."¹ In other words, mysticism is and ever has been at the root of all religions, the lowest and the highest.

There are two roads which lead to mysticism. One is the negative road of asceticism, the other, the positive road of culture and expansiveness. The former leads to morbid introspection, idle contemplation and abstraction, — to passive and philosophic mysticism ; the latter to objective mysticism or symbolism, to creative and artistic mysticism. Either or both may be religious. The former is strewn with the dry bones of men who lived unnatural and unfruitful lives, the latter has been trod by men who will be sources of inspiration to the end of time.

It is of course impossible to give an adequate historical account of mysticism in one chapter, but a few specimens from the mystic literature of the different peoples is necessary for a proper understanding of its various forms.²

BRAHMANISM.

One of the earliest ethnic religions in which mysticism appears is Brahmanism. The ancient philosophy of this religion, the Vedânta Sara, teaches that there is only one Being in the Universe, one universal soul, Brahma, which has no qualities or attributes. "It is," is all that can be said of it. If we wish to describe it we can do so only negatively. All else is Mâyâ, or illusion. All human souls are a part of

¹ *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 52 ff.

² The materials in this survey are taken from Vaughan : *Half Hours with Mystics* ; Inge : *Christian Mysticism* ; Jas. Freeman Clarke : *Mystics in All Religions* ; and in a few instances from original sources.

the universal soul, but they are enclosed in illusive shells (the body) from which they should try to escape and be reabsorbed into Brahma. But this they can do only by knowledge. They must learn that the body and the brain with all its faculties are mere illusions, that Brahma is all in all, there is naught else besides him. So long as man feels that he is something—an individuality, he is nothing, but as soon as he perceives that he is nothing, then he has knowledge and is all. This knowledge frees his soul from the body, whence it returns to its source. To be reabsorbed into Brahma, to be Brahma is the supreme object of life.¹ The great philosopher Sankhara says, "I am Brahma, I am eternally pure, free, one, constant. Whoever annihilates all his desires, and ceases from himself, then becomes one with the Universal spirit. The knower of God becomes God." A similar thought runs through the later Buddhism. The universe is a snare and delusion. There is no personal God, no individual soul; only the impersonal law of Karman, or righteousness, and the greatest blessing is Nirvana, or an eternal state analogous to dreamless sleep. This is reached by climbing what Hilton calls the "Ladder of Perfection." The first stage is reached by annihilating the desire and concentrating the mind upon one point. In the second stage the intellectual activities cease to function but the satisfied sense of unity remains. In the third stage the satisfaction departs, and indifference begins, along with memory and self-consciousness. In the fourth stage the indifference, memory and self-consciousness are perfected. (The meaning of the terms 'memory' and 'self-consciousness' is doubtful here). Still higher stages of contemplation are mentioned—"a region where there exists nothing, and where the meditator says, 'There exists absolutely nothing,' and stops. Then he reaches another region where he says: 'There are neither ideas nor absence of ideas,' and stops again. Then another region where, 'having reached the end of both idea and perception, he stops finally.' This would seem to be, not yet Nirvana, but as close an approach to it as this life affords."²

The mysticism of India is of the philosophic type. It is the product of centuries of excessive thinking with little or

¹ Cf. Hunt: Pantheism and Christianity, especially p. 14. Also Josiah Royce: The World, and the Individual, pp. 47-87, and 141-182. An excellent exposition of philosophical mysticism.

² James: Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 401.

no accompanying muscular activity. It instills in its disciples the *nil admirari* spirit, withdraws them from the healthy activities of life, and renders them useless citizens of the world. They yearn for the negative peace of death and not for the fullness of life. It is a religion, if indeed it is a religion at all, fit only for the dying. When healthy individuals, or those whose minds are not sufficiently philosophic, endeavor to attain this Nirvanic condition through artificial means, the results are extremely pathological. Abundant examples of this are found among the Indian sect called Yogins. "On the borders of the Ganges," writes Baring-Gould, "the Yogi strives by every exaggeration of torture to emancipate his soul, and confound it with God; falling into raptures of ecstatic love, his soul addresses the Deity as a wife speaks to her husband. Yogins swarming with vermin, covered with dirt, mixing filth with their food, running skewers through their cheeks, suspending themselves by hooks thrust into their flesh, standing on one foot many years, being for half a life-time upon sharp nails, strive by withdrawing their affections from all things here below, to fix them with greater intensity on the Divinity above."¹ The *yoga* condition is realized only after five states of *yama* have been mastered.

SUFISM.

Although Mohammedanism, of all religions, except the Jewish, is the most inimical to mysticism, we find within its fold a large number of mystics. "Each succeeding century of the Hegira," writes Vaughan, "was found more abundant than the last in a class of men who revolted against the letter in the name of the spirit, and who aspired to a converse and a unity with God such as the Koran deemed unattainable on this side heaven. The names of the saints and martyrs, the poets and philosophers of mysticism, are among the brightest in the hagiography and the literature of the Mohammedan world."

Mohammed himself was a mystic, and his religious system was built upon the revelations vouchsafed him during his trances.

It is chiefly among the Persian Mohammedans, however, that ascetic mysticism, known as Sufism, found its stronghold. The Sufis taught that God is everything, and every-

¹ *Origin and Develop. of Religious Belief*, p. 366.

thing is God in becoming. The supreme goal of life is absorption into God, which can be attained by ascetic exercises followed by inaction, solitude, ecstasy, and transport.

The first of the Sufis was a female saint, named Rabia, a sister in spirit to Mme. Guyon. The story is told of her, that once, when she was sick, two holy men stood by her bedside discussing religious subjects. One of them said, "The praise of that man is not sincere who refuses to bear the chastening strokes of the Lord." The other went beyond him, saying, "He is not sincere who does not rejoice in them." Rabia, detecting something of self in that very joy, surpassed them both as she added, "He is not sincere who does not, beholding his Lord, become totally unconscious of them."

She declared herself spouse of heaven,—described her will and personality as lost in God. When asked how she had reached this stage she replied, "I attained it when everything which I had found I lost again in God." When questioned as to the mode she replied, "Thou, Hassan, hast found Him by reason and through means; I immediately, without mode or means." This is an example of spontaneous mysticism.

Bustami, a Persian Sufi of the ninth century, is one of the most extravagant of mystics. To believe in one's individuality and existence was to him idolatry, the worst of crimes.

"When man adores God," he said, "God adores himself." So absorbed was he in Deity that he declared himself the divine power and wisdom and goodness. "I am a sea without bottom, without beginning, without end," he cried, "I am the throne of God, the word of God. I am Gabriel, Michael, Israfil; I am Abraham, Moses, Jesus."

It is interesting to compare with this the lines of the American mystic and philosopher Emerson :

"I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar's hand, and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart, and Shakespeare's strain."

Jalaluddin Rumi, a Sufi poet of the thirteenth century, gives the following allegorical account of the mystical aims and ideal. In order to settle a dispute between the Chinese and Greeks as to which race is the more skillful in the art of decoration, a certain Sultan to whom they appealed bade the rival artists to manifest their skill on two structures facing each other.

“The Chinese ask him for a thousand colors,
 All that they ask he gives right royally;
 And every morning from his treasure-house
 A hundred sorts are largely dealt them out.
 The Greeks despise all color as a stain,—
 Effacing every hue with neatest care.
 Brighter and brighter shines their polished front,
 More dazzling, soon, than gleams the floor of heaven.
 This hueless sheen is worth a thousand dyes,—
 This is the moon—they but her cloudy veil;
 All that the cloud is bright or golden with
 Is but the lending of the moon or sun.
 And now at length, are China’s artists ready.
 The cymbals clang—the Sultan hastens thither,
 And sees enrapt the glorious gorgeousness—
 Smit nigh to swooning by those beamy splendors.—
 Then, to the Grecian palace opposite.
 Just as the Greeks have put their curtain back,
 Down glides a sunbeam through the rifted clouds,
 And, lo, the colors of that rainbow house
 Shine, all reflected on those glassy walls
 That face them, rivalling; the sun hath painted
 With lovlier blending, on that stony mirror
 The colors spread by man so artfully.
 Know then, O friend! such Greeks the Sufis are,
 Owning nor book nor master; and on earth
 Having one sole and simple task,—to make
 Their hearts a stainless mirror for their God.
 Is thy heart clear and argent as the moon?
 Then imaged there may rest, innumerable,
 The forms and hues of heaven.”¹

The last phrases: To make their *hearts* a stainless mirror for their God. Is thy *heart* clear and argent as the moon? are significant and characteristic expressions employed by almost all religious mystics. Indeed, we may say that the heart, or the feelings, especially those connected with the sexual impulse, is the seat of religious mysticism, just as the brain is the seat of philosophy and science. In the religious type of mysticism the senses and intellect play an insignificant and undesirable rôle; the voice of reason is silenced, the exercise of the senses suspended, and sometimes even destroyed by every conceivable device. With Florizel in the Winter’s Tale, the mystic is almost willing to say:

“I am; and by my fancy; if my reason
 Will thereto be obedient, I have reason;
 If not, my senses better pleased with madness
 Do bid it welcome.”

In every land and every age the mystic has been enjoined to

“Put wool within the ear of flesh, for that
 Makes deaf the inner hearing, as with wool;

¹ Cf. the account given by Al Ghazali, a Persian philosopher and theologian, Quoted by James, Varieties of Religious Experience, pp. 402-405.

If that can hear, the spirit's ear is deaf.
Let sense make blind no more the spirit's eye.
Be without ear, without a sense or thought,
Hark only to the voice, Home, wanderer, home!"

And that home, it need hardly be said, is not on earth, among fellow-beings, but far away in the dark, inane, transcendental realm where time and space, thoughts and feelings, and all earthly experiences are completely forgotten. The strenuous efforts to mortify the flesh and make of the brain a polished 'tabula rasa' often undermine the physical and psychical health of the mystic, and many of their experiences remind us forcibly of the dreams and hallucinations of fever patients. The servant Said, for example, thus describes to Mohammed his mystical experience :

"My tongue clave fever-dry, my blood ran fire,
My nights were sleepless with consuming love,
Till night and day sped past—as flies a lance
Grazing a buckler's rim; a hundred faiths
Seemed then as one; a hundred thousand years
No longer than a moment. In that hour
All past eternity and all to come
Was gathered up in one stupendous NOW,—
Let understanding marvel as it may.
Where men see clouds, on the ninth heaven I gaze,
And see the throne of God. All heaven and hell
Are bare to me and all men's destinies,
The heavens and earth, they vanish at my glance:
The dead rise at my look. I tear the veil
From all the worlds, and in the hall of heaven
I set me central, radiant as the sun."

Then spake the prophet :

"Friend, thy steed is warm;
Spur him no more. The mirror in thy breast
Did slip its fleshly case, now put it up—
Hide it once more, or thou wilt come to harm."

Almost all the literature of Persian mysticism is written in verse, the true language of love and religion. It is to the Orient, and especially to Persia, the home of the well-known Sufi poet Omar Khayyam that we must turn if we wish to see the highest development of the emotions. One of the oldest of civilized peoples, they possess, more perhaps, than any other, the oldest element in human nature and the power to express it. It is little wonder, then, that when the Persians received Mohammedanism they should have breathed into it the warm breath of their own emotional lives, and made of it an intoxicating love-feast.

The following lines from Mahmud's 'Gulschen Ras' show us a religion permeated from centre to circumference with

the Persian spirit, a religion born of the Persian clime and vine.

“Know’st thou who the Host may be who pours the spirit’s wine
 Know’st thou what his liquor is whose taste is so divine?
 The Host is thy Beloved One—the wine annihilation,
 And in the fiery draught thy soul drinks in illumination.
 Up, soul! and drink with burning lip the wine of ecstasy,
 The drop should haste to lose itself in His unbounded sea.
 At such a draught mere intellect swims wildered and grows wild;
 Love puts the slave-ring in his ear and makes the rebel mild.
 Our Friend holds out the royal wine and bids us drink it up;
 The whole world is a drinking-house and everything a cup,
 Drunken even Wisdom lies—all in revel sunken;
 Drunken are the earth and heaven; all the angels drunken.
 Giddy is the very sky, round so often hastening,
 Up and down it staggers wide, with but a single tasting.
 Such the wine of might they drink in blest carouse above.
 So the angels higher lift their flaming height of love.
 Now and then the dregs they fling earthward in their quaffing
 And where’er a drop alights, lo, an Eden laughing.”

Most of the terms here have, of course, a symbolic and mystical meaning, and in this respect it resembles the Hebrew mystic poem, the Song of Songs. Like the latter also, Sufi literature abound in erotic expressions, and furnishes further evidence of the close relation between love and religion.

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM.

Passing over the primitive kind of mysticism in ancient Judaism, the patriarchs who conversed familiarly with Jehovah, Moses, and the later prophets, we come next to early Christianity, which may be described as Judaism tinged with Platonic mysticism. The Jewish Jehovah was a ‘deus ex machina’ whose kingdom was in a far-distant transcendental realm, whereas the God of the Gospel writers is an immanent God, a ‘deus in nobis’ whose kingdom is in every individual. The statement of Richard of St. Victor, “If thou wishest to search out the deep things of God, search out the depths of thine own spirit” is a clear expression of this conviction. Similar statements are found in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, the first of the Christian mystics, and also in the writings of St. Paul.

But these lofty conceptions were later interpreted by inferior minds to mean that, hidden within the frame of flesh there is a divine particle, a precious gem, as it were, buried in much worthless soil, which if we dig deep enough we will surely find, and then be able to declare with ST. PAUL, “I

live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.''¹ This belief, as we shall see, led to utter contempt for the body and worldly affairs, and to practices which were positively pathological. St. Paul tells us in unmistakable language that a trance in which he saw Jesus was the cause of his conversion to Christianity.¹ Later, during his missionary journeys he saw more visions, heard voices, and believed himself to be guided by the "Spirit of Jesus,"² and in another place he tells us that he was "caught up to the third heaven . . . into paradise, and heard unspeakable words."³ There can be no doubt that these visions exerted a great influence upon Paul and his converts. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he goes so far as to commend prophecy and speaking in unknown tongues, and eighteen centuries later his injunction bore fruit in the form of Irvingism.

A contemporary of Paul, and one who exerted a great influence on the early Christian Church was PHILO, a Hellenized Jew, and a father of Neo-Platonism. According to him we can obtain true knowledge and virtue only by self-renunciation, and contemplation of the Divine Essence. The soul should cut off its right hand. . . . It should shun the whirlpool of life, and not even touch it with the tip of a finger. The soul of man is divine, and his highest wisdom is to become as much as possible a stranger to the body with its embarrassing appetites.⁴ The highest stage is when a man leaves behind his finite self-consciousness, and sees God face to face, standing in Him from henceforward, and knowing Him not by reason, but by clear certainty.⁵ The great aim of Philo was to wed philosophy to religion; to harmonize the speculations of his "divine Plato" to the dogmatic teachings of Moses, which was indeed a fantastical attempt. PLOTINUS, the founder of Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, though not a Christian is always considered, on account of his great influence on early Christian thought, in works on Christian Mysticism. He lived the life of an ascetic, and endeavored by excessive austerities to realize what he calls the 'angelic life; the 'life of the disembodied in the body.' Inspired by Ammonius Saccas and Numerius he reacted strongly against the universal skepticism which prevailed in his day,

¹ Acts, 22:6-11; 17:21. 26:13-18. Gal. 1:12.

² Acts, 15:9-10; 18:9; 27:23-24.

³ 2 Cor. 12:2-4.

⁴ R. A. Vaughan: 1, p. 67.

⁵ Inge: Christian Mysticism, p. 85.

and which was naturally distasteful to him. "Truth, according to Plotinus, is not the agreement of our apprehension of an external object with the object itself, it is rather the agreement of the mind with itself. The objects we contemplate and that which contemplates, are identical for the philosopher. Both are thought; only like can know like; all truth is within us. By reducing the soul to its most abstract simplicity, we subtilize it so that it expands into the infinite. In such a state we transcend our finite selves, and are one with the infinite; this is the privileged condition of ecstasy. These blissful intervals, but too evanescent and too rare, were regarded as the reward of philosophic asceticism—the seasons of refreshing, which were to make amends for all the stoical austerities of the steep ascent towards the abstraction of the primal unity. "I myself," he writes, "have realized it (ecstasy) but three times as yet, and Porphyry hitherto not once."¹

He gives us the following psychological description of ecstasy: "The soul when possessed by intense love of Him divests herself of all form which she has, even of that which is derived from Intelligence; for it is impossible, when in conscious possession of any other attribute, either to behold or to be harmonized with Him. Thus the soul must be neither good nor bad nor aught else, that she may receive Him only; Him alone, she alone." If the soul has reached this condition it melts into Him, "and they are no more two but one; and the soul is no more conscious of the body or of the mind, but knows that she has what she desired, that she is where no deception can come, and that she would not exchange her bliss for all the heaven of heavens."² This, it will be seen, is hardly distinguishable from the Vedanta philosophy.

The next great name we reach is HIEROTHEUS, probably a Syrian mystic and teacher of Dionysius the Areopagite. "The system of Hierotheus is not exactly Pantheism, but Pan-Nihilism. Everything is an emanation from the Chaos of bare indetermination which he calls God, and everything will return thither. There are three periods of existence—1. the present world, which is evil, and is characterized by motion; 2. the progressive union with Christ, who is all, and in this is the period of rest; 3. the period of fusion of all things in the Absolute. The three Persons of the Trin-

¹ R. A. Vaughan: 2, pp. 76-81.

² See Inge: p. 97.

ity, he dares to say, will then be swallowed up, and even the devils are thrown into the same melting-pot. Consistently with mystical principles, these three world periods are also phases in the development of individual souls. In the first stage the mind aspires towards its first principles ; in the second it becomes Christ, the universal Mind ; in the third its personality is wholly merged. The greater part of his book is taken up with the adventures of the Mind in climbing the ladder of perfection ; it is a kind of theosophical romance, much more elaborate and fantastic than the "revelations" of medieval mystics. The author professes to have himself enjoyed the ecstatic union more than once, and his method of preparing for it is that of the Quietists : "To me it seems right to speak without words, and understand without knowledge that which is above words and knowledge ; this I apprehend to be nothing but the mysterious silence and mystical quiet which destroys consciousness and dissolves forms. Seek, therefore, silently and mystically, that perfect and primitive union with the Arch-God."

At one stage of the "ascent of the Mind it is crucified, with the soul on the right and the body on the left ; it is buried for three days ; it descends into Hades ; then it ascends again, till it reaches Paradise, and then is united to the tree of life : then it descends below all essences, and sees a formless luminous essence, and marvels that it is the *same essence* that it has seen on high. Now it comprehends the truth, that God is consubstantial with the Universe, and that there are no real distinctions anywhere. So it ceases to wander. 'All these doctrines,' concludes the seer, 'which are unknown even to angels, have I disclosed to thee, my son' (Dionysius, probably). 'Know, then, that all nature will be confused with the Father—that nothing will perish or be destroyed, but all will return, be sanctified, united, and confused. Thus God will be all in all.'¹ This, as will readily be seen, is a combination of Oriental and Christian Mysticism and Neo-Platonism.

DIONYSIUS lays great stress on the "negative road" to God ; on abstraction or rather subtraction. The argument for this procedure is stated clearly and briefly by Mr. Inge as follows : "Since God is the Infinite, and the Infinite is

¹ Inge: Christian Mysticism, pp. 102-104.

the antithesis of the finite, every attribute which can be affirmed of a finite being may be safely denied of God. Hence God can only be *described* by negatives. He can only be discovered by stripping off all the qualities and attributes which veil Him; He can only be reached by divesting ourselves of all the distinctions of personality, and sinking or rising into our "uncreated nothingness;" and he can only be imitated by aiming at an abstract spirituality, the passionless "apathy" of an universal, which is nothing in particular."¹

"Nearly all that repels us in medieval religious life," adds Mr. Inge, "its 'other-worldliness,' and passive hostility to civilization—the emptiness of its ideal life—its maltreatment of the body—its disparagement of family life—the respect which it paid to indolent contemplation—springs from this one root."

Leaving early oriental and Christian mysticism, we shall next glance hurriedly at later European mysticism. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we encounter such names as Bernard, Hugo, and Richard of St. Victor, Bonaventura and Albertus Magnus. It will suffice for our purpose to quote a few paragraphs from the last named writer, which will show how great a barrier the "negative road" had become to the march of civilization.

"When St. John says that God is a Spirit," says Albertus in the first paragraph of his treatise '*De adhaerendo Deo*,' and that He must be worshipped in spirit, he means that the mind must be cleared of all images. When thou prayest, shut thy door—that is, the doors of thy senses. Keep them barred and bolted against all phantasms and images. Nothing pleases God more than a mind free from all occupations and distractions. Such a mind is in a manner transformed into God, for it can think of nothing, and love nothing, except God; other creatures and itself it only sees in God. He who penetrates into himself, and so transcends himself, ascends truly to God. He whom I love and desire is above all that is sensible, and all that is intelligible; sense and imagination cannot bring us to Him, but only the desire of a pure heart. This brings us into the darkness of the mind, whereby we can ascend to the con-

¹ Inge: *Christian Mysticism*, p. 3, and Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics*, Vol. 1, pp. 117.

temptation even of the mystery of the Trinity. Do not think about the world, nor about thy friends, nor about the past, present or future ; but consider thyself to be outside of the world and alone with God, as if thy soul were already separated from the body and had no longer any interest in peace or war, or the state of the world. Leave thy body and fix thy gaze on the uncreated light. Let nothing come between thee and God. The soul in contemplation views the world from afar off, just as, when we proceed to God by the way of abstraction, we deny Him, first of all, bodily and sensible attributes, then intelligible qualities, and, lastly that *being* (*esse*) which keeps Him among created things.” This, according to Dionysius, is the best mode of union with God.¹

Similar views, only much more emphasized and exaggerated, were held by Meister Eckart, a great German speculative mystic of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The following are the salient points in his mysticism :

“ He who is at all times alone is worthy of God. He who is at all times at home, to him is God present. He who standeth at all times in a present *Now* in him doth God the Father bring forth his son without ceasing. . . . He who finds one thing otherwise than another—to whom God is dearer in one thing than another, that man is carnal, and still afar off and a child. But he to whom God is alike in all things hath become a man. . . . All that is in the Godhead is one. Thereof we can say nothing. It is above all names, above all nature. The essence cf all creatures, is eternally a divine life in Deity. God works. So doth not the Godhead. Therein they are distinguished,—in working and not working. The end of all things is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead, unknown and never to be known.”

“ I declare by good truth and truth everlasting, that in every man who hath utterly abandoned self, God must communicate himself according to all his power, so completely that he retains nothing in His life, in His essence, in His nature, in His Godhead—He must communicate all to the bringing forth of fruit.”

“ When the Will is so united that it becometh a one in oneness, then doth the Heavenly Father produce his only

¹ Inge: *Christian Mysticism*, p. 145.

begotten Son in Himself and in me. Wherefore in Himself and in me? I am one with Him—He cannot exclude me. In the self-same operation doth the Holy Ghost receive his existence, and proceeds from me as from God. Wherefore? I am in God, and if the Holy Ghost deriveth not his being from me, He deriveth it not from God. I am in nowise excluded."

"There is something in the soul which is above the soul, divine, simple, and absolute Nothing, rather unnamed than named, unknown than known. So long as thou lookest on thyself as a *Something*, so long thou knowest as little what this is, as my mouth knows what color is, or as my eye knows what taste is. Of this I am wont to speak in my sermons, and sometimes I have called it a Power, sometimes an uncreated Light, sometimes a divine Spark. It is absolute and free from all names and forms, as God is free and absolute in Himself. It is higher than knowledge, higher than love, higher than grace. For in all these there is still distinction. In this power doth blossom and flourish God, with all His Godhead, and the Spirit flourished in God. In this power doth the Father bring forth His only-begotten Son, as essentially as in Himself, and in this light ariseth the Holy Ghost. This Spark rejects all creatures, and will have only God, simple as He is in Himself. It rests satisfied neither with the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Ghost, nor with the three Persons, as far as each exists in its respective attributes. I will say what sounds more marvellous yet. This Light is satisfied only with the super-essential essence. It is bent on entering into the simple Ground, the still Waste, where is no distinction, neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost, into the Unity where no man dwelleth. There is it satisfied in the light, there it is one; then is it in itself, immovable; and yet by this Immobility are all things moved."

"God in Himself was not God—in the creature only hath He become God—I ask to be rid of God—that is, that God, by His grace, would bring me into the Essence—that Essence which is above God, and above distinction. I would enter into that eternal Unity which was mine before all time, when I was what I would, and would what I was;—into a state above all addition or diminution!—into the Immobility whereby all is moved."

"Folks say to me often—‘Pray God for me.’ Then I

think with myself, ‘ Why go ye out? Why abide ye not in your own selves, and take hold on your own possession? Ye have all truth essentially within you.’ ”

“ God and I are one in Knowing. God’s Essence is His Knowing, and God’s Knowing makes me to Know Him. Therefore is His Knowing my Knowing. The eye whereby I see God is the same eye whereby He seeth me. Mine eye and the eye of God are one eye, one vision, one Knowledge, and one love.” According to Eckart, to believe in one’s individuality is a sin; it is both stealing from God and cheating one’s own self. “ I hesitate to receive anything from God,” he says, “ for to be indebted to Him would imply inferiority, and make a distinction between Him and me; whereas, the righteous man is, without distinction, in substance and in nature, what God is.”

“ If any man hath understood this sermon, it is well for him. Had not a soul of you been here, I must have spoken the very same words. He who hath not understood it, let him not trouble his heart therewith, for as long as a man is not himself like unto this truth, so long will he never understand it, *seeing that it is no truth of reflection, to be thought out, but is come directly out of the heart of God without medium.*”¹

“ Some people are for seeing God with their eyes, as they can see a cow (which thou lovest for the milk and for the cheese, and for thine own profit). Thus do all those who love God for the sake of outward riches or of inward comfort; they do not love aright, but seek only themselves and their own advantage. . . . God is a pure good in Himself, and therefore will he dwell nowhere save in a pure soul. There He may pour Himself out; into that He can wholly flow. What is purity? It is that man should have turned himself away from all creatures, and have set his heart so entirely on the pure good, that no creature is to him a comfort, that he has no desire for aught creaturely, save as far as he may apprehend therein the pure good which is God. And as little as the bright eye can endure aught foreign in it, so little can the pure soul bear anything in it, any stain, aught between it and God. To it all creatures are pure to enjoy, for it enjoyeth all creatures in God, and God in all creatures. Yea, so pure is that soul that she seeth through

¹ The italics are mine.

herself, she needeth not to seek God afar off, she finds Him in herself, when, in her natural purity, she hath flowed out into the supernatural of the pure Godhead. And this is she in God and God in her, and what she doeth that she doeth in God and God doeth it in her."

"Then shall a man be truly poor when he is as free from his creature will as he was before he was born. And I say to you, by the eternal truth, that so long as ye desire to fulfill the will of God, and have any desire after eternity and God, so long are ye not truly poor. He alone hath true spiritual poverty who wills nothing, knows nothing, desires nothing."

"For us to follow truly what God willeth, is to follow that whereto we are most inclined,—whereto we feel most frequent inward exhortation and strongest attraction. The inner voice is the voice of God."¹

Such are Dr. Eckart's labored and negative descriptions of God and the soul's mystical union with Him. It is very difficult to determine exactly where he belongs. In his teachings there appear elements of pantheism, German idealism, Buddhism, Sufism, quietism, ego-theism; in fact, nearly every 'ism' in the mystical catalogue. That his life was pure and holy, and even inspiring; that his mind's eye caught intermittent flashes of divine light there can be no doubt, but that his mind was well balanced is hard to believe. He was the peculiar product of a turbulent age, an age which had already begun to react violently against dry formalism, orthodoxy, and the tyranny of the Church. He came to teach men the truth they had long since forgotten, namely, that religion is to be found not in the Church, but in the inmost depths of their own hearts; that Christ could be reached immediately as well, if not better, than through the medium of a corrupted Church, which claimed to be the sole possessor of the keys of heaven. His mission was a grand and lofty one, but he suffered the fate of the majority of reactionists; he rebounded too far in the other direction. Disgusted with objectivism and church-slavery, he wipes the former completely out with one sweep of the hand, making subjectivism the all in all, and for the latter he gives

¹ These quotations are taken from Mr. R. A. Vaughan (*Hours with the Mystics*, p. 188-195, Vol. 1), who has translated and paraphrased them from Eckart's original writings and from the German authorities, Martensen and Schmidt.

us not liberty but unbridled license, which is so dear to the hearts of the rabble. It is only, however, through such extremes that the golden mean is finally reached, and from this point of view we must certainly grant that Meister Eckart lived and toiled not in vain.¹

Of TAULER, RUYSBROECK, SUSO, NICHOLAS OF BASLE, the author of "German Theology" and others, the successors, and in a sense the disciples of Eckart, we have very little to say. They were all of them great and devout men, who by their teachings and exemplary lives did much to weaken the power of the Popes over the minds and bodies of men, and were potent factors in bringing on the Reformation.

Their mysticism was not as thorough-going as Eckart's; there is less pantheism, less morbid introspection, less quietism, and much more of the positive, human qualities and virtues in their doctrines. They point and lead us to the 'via affirmativa,' the road of healthy activity, though they could not themselves progress very far along it, so encumbered were they with the heavy chains which stretched back for several centuries.

Of TAULER, Luther writes to Spalatin, "If you would be pleased to make acquaintance with a solid theology of the good old sort in the German tongue, get John Tauler's sermons; for neither in Latin nor in our own language have I ever seen a theology more sound or more in harmony with the Gospel." A few quotations from Tauler's writings will show that this praise was quite well-merited. Repudiating pantheism Tauler says, "God is the Being of all beings, but He is none of all things. God is all, but all is not God; He far transcends the universe in which He is imminent."² He also lays great stress on the active will and has little patience with the quietists who linger on the 'via negativa.' "We must lop and prune vices," he says, "not nature, which is in itself good and noble. . . . Christ himself never arrived at the *emptiness* of which these men (the negative mystics) talk." Of contemplation he says, "Spiritual enjoyments are the food of the soul, and are only to be taken for nourishment and support to help us in our active work.

¹ An excellent criticism of Eckart is to be found in Inge, *loc cit.*, pp. 148-166.

² Inge: *loc. cit.*, pp. 183.

Sloth often makes men fain to be excused from their work and set to contemplation. Never trust in a virtue that has not been put into practice."¹ The following are the conditions of true Mysticism. "No one can be free from the observance of the laws of God and the practice of virtue. No one can unite himself to God in emptiness without true love and desire for God. No one can be holy without becoming holy, without good works. No one may rest in God without love for God. No one can be exalted to a stage which he has not longed for or felt." Again, "If a man, while busy in this lofty inward work, were called by some duty in the Providence of God to cease therefrom and cook a broth for some sick person, or any other such service, he should do so willingly and with great joy. This I say, that if it happened to me that I had to forsake such work and go out to preach or aught else, I should go cheerfully, believing not only that God would be with me, but that he would vouchsafe me, it may be, even greater grace and blessing in that external work undertaken out of true love in the service of my neighbor than I should perhaps receive in my season of loftiest contemplation."²

There are those who thoughtlessly maim and torture their miserable flesh, and yet leave untouched the inclinations which are the root of evil in their hearts. Ah, my friend, what hath thy poor body done to thee that thou shouldst so torment it? Oh folly! Mortify and slay thy sins, not thine own flesh and blood."³

His mysticism is well epitomized in the following two sentences from his sermon on the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity. "When through all manner of exercises the outward man has been converted into the inward, reasonable man, and thus the two, that is to say, the powers of the senses and the powers of the reason, are gathered up into the very centre of the man's being—the unseen depths of his spirit wherein lies the image of God,—and thus he flings himself into the divine abyss, in which he dwelt eternally before he was created; then when God finds the man thus simply and nakedly turned towards Him, the Godhead bends down and descends into the depths of the pure, waiting soul, and transforms the created soul, drawing it up into the

¹ Inge: *loc. cit.*, pp. 188.

² Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics*, 1, pp. 247.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 251.

uncreated essence, so that the spirit becomes one with Him. Could such a man behold himself, he would see himself so noble that he would fancy himself God, and see himself a thousand times nobler than he is in himself, and would perceive all the thoughts and purposes, words and works, and have all the knowledge of all men that ever were.”¹

RUYSBROECK is no less sparing in his criticism and condemnation of the passive, easy-going mystics. There are some he says, who mistake mere laziness for holy abstraction ; others give the rein to “spiritual self-indulgence ;” others neglect all religious exercises ; others fall into anti-nomianism, and “think that nothing is forbidden to them”—“they will gratify any appetite which interrupts their contemplation :” these are “by far the worst of all.” “There is another error,” he proceeds, “of those who like to call themselves ‘theopaths.’ They take every impulse to be Divine, and repudiate all responsibility. Most of them live in invert sloth.”² These are veins of pure gold, but unfortunately there is much worthless ore encasing them, much mysticism of the type dealt with in the earlier part of this chapter. Tauler and his brother mystics are too close to Eckart and the mystics of the preceding centuries to be able to completely free themselves from their influence. The sun is just beginning to peep through the thick clouds, but they are not dispersed yet. The full light of truth has not yet broken upon the European Christians. Luther is still unborn.

Passing over from Germany to Spain we meet with two great mystics contending with might and main against the rapid progress of the Reformation—ST. THERESA and ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS. The mysticism of the Germans, as we have seen, was speculative and autonomous ; that of the Spaniards, congruent with their temperaments, was emotional and controlled by the Church. “The church, by means of the confessor,” writes Mr. Vaughan, “made mysticism itself the innermost dungeon of her prison-house. Every emotion was methodically docketed ; every yearning of the heart minutely catalogued. The sighs must always ascend in the right place ; the tears must trickle in orthodox course. The prying calculations of the casuist had measured the sweep of every wave in the heaving ocean of the soul.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 290.

² Inge: *loc. cit.*, pp. 171.

The instant terrible knife cut off the first spray of love that shot out beyond the trimly shaven border of prescription. Strong feelings were dangerous guests, unless they knew (like the old Romans) when to go home and slay themselves, did that Tiberius, the director, but bestow on them a frown."¹

The story of ST. THERESA'S life furnishes us a clew to her mysticism. Her earliest intellectual food was *The Lives of the Saints*. These produced such an impression upon her childish mind that at the age of seven she resolved to become a martyr like the heroes and heroines of her books, and set out with her younger brother on a walk to Africa where she hoped to be slaughtered by the Moors. Her plans, however, were frustrated by her uncle who met them at the bridge and restored them to their parents. Her doll's houses were nunneries and in the garden her favorite occupation was making mud hermitages. At the age of fifteen she was sent off to a convent, and later determined to become a nun. She escaped to a Carmelite convent. In her twentieth year she took the vows. Shortly afterwards she was stricken with a complication of diseases,—cramps, convulsions, catalepsies, vomitings, faintings, etc., etc. "At one time she lay four days in a state of coma; her grave was dug, hot wax had been dropped upon her eyelids, and extreme unction administered; the funeral service was performed; when she came to herself, expressed her desire to confess, and received absolution. These troubles she attributed to natural causes, but when they recurred later in life she attributed them to supernatural causes. . . . After three years (thanks to St. Joseph) Theresa was restored to comparative health, but remained subject all her life, at intervals, to severe pains. On her recovery, she found her heart at peace, but too much divided between Christ and the world. That is to say, she was glad when her friends came to see her, and she enjoyed witty and agreeable chat, through the grating, with ladies whose conversation was not always confined to spiritual topics. She was conscience-stricken for such unfaithfulness, and bitterly regretted the laxity of her confessors, who failed to tell her that it was a heinous crime. In her twenty-fourth year, she resumed the practice of mental prayer, and for the next

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 1, pp. 152.

twenty years continued it, with many inward vicissitudes, and alternate tendernesses and desertions on the part of the Divine Bridegroom.¹

The turning point in her life came in her forty-first year, when she read St. Augustine's "Confessions." "When I came to his conversion," she says, "and read how he heard the voice in the garden, it was just as if the Lord called me." It was soon after this that she began again to have visual and auditory hallucinations and comatose states. About her fiftieth year she was appointed prioress of a convent of the Carmelite Order, in which there were to be thirteen fervent virgins, "discalced, serge-clad, flesh-abhorrung, couched on straw, and all but perpetually dumb." From now until her death, she was busily engaged founding convents and monasteries of barefooted Carmelites. Of the former she lived to see sixteen established; of the latter, fourteen. Her ideal man was Peter of Alcantara, "who for forty years never slept more than an hour and a half in the twenty-four, and then in a sitting posture, with his head against a wooden peg in the wall;" who ate in general only every third day; and who looked, she says, as if he were made of the roots of trees.²

Her mysticism appears in her accounts of her visions and the descriptions of the four kinds of prayer. On one occasion, she tells us, she was favored with a brief experience of the place she merited in hell:—a kind of low oven, pitch dark, miry, stinking, full of vermin, where sitting and lying were alike impossible; where the walls seemed to press in upon the sufferer—crushing, stifling, burning; where in solitude the lost nature is its own tormentor, tearing itself in a desperate misery, interminable, and so intense, that all she had endured from racking disease was delightful in comparison.

At another time, while smitten for five hours together with intolerable pains, the Lord was pleased to make her understand that she was tempted by the devil, and she saw him at her side like a very horrible little negro, gnashing his teeth at her. At last she contrived to sprinkle some holy water on the place where he was. That moment he and her pains vanished together, and her body remained as though she had been severely beaten. . . . The said devil

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 154.

² Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 157.

squatted one day on her breviary, and at another time had all but strangled her. She once saw with the eye of her soul, two devils encompassing, with their meeting horns, the neck of a sinful priest ; and at the funeral of a man who had died without confession, a whole swarm of devils tearing and tossing the body and sporting in the grave.

Much more numerous, however, were her visions of celestial objects. "Being one day in prayer," she tells us, "our Lord was pleased to show me his sacred hands, of excessive and indescribable beauty ; afterwards his divine face, and finally, at mass, all his most sacred humanity." At one of his appearances, he drew out with his right hand the nail which transfixes his left, some of the flesh following it. Three times did she behold in her raptures the most sublime of all visions—the humanity of Christ in the bosom of the Father ; very clear to her mind but impossible to explain. While reciting the Athanasian Creed the mystery of the Trinity was unfolded to her with unutterable wonderment and comfort. Our Lord paid her one day the compliment of saying, that if He had not already created heaven He would have done so for her sake alone.

"When reciting the hours one day with the nuns, my soul suddenly lapsed into a state of recollection, and appeared to me as a bright mirror, every part of which, back and sides, top and bottom, was perfectly clear. In the centre of this was represented to me Christ our Lord, as I am accustomed to see him. I seemed to see him in all the parts of my soul also, distinctly as in a mirror, and at the same time this mirror (I do not know how to express it) was all engraven in the Lord himself, by a communication exceeding amorous which I cannot describe. I know that this vision was a great advantage to me, and has been every time I have called it to mind, more especially after communion. I was given to understand, that when a soul is in mortal sin, this mirror is covered with a great cloud, and grows very dark, so that the Lord cannot be seen or represented in us, though He is always present as the Author of our being. In heretics, the mirror is, as it were, broken, which is much worse than to have it obscured."¹

There are very many other visions recorded, but these will suffice to show her mental abnormality. The majority,

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 160 ff.

if not all of them, can be paralleled in any of our insane asylums. The writer has interviewed several female patients in the Worcester Insane Hospital, who had both seen and conversed with Christ. They referred to Him as their Bridegroom, and in many other respects they were not unlike St. Theresa. That some sexual disturbance is at the bottom of such trances and hallucinations, the investigations of alienists leave no doubt.¹

In her "Life" St. Theresa gives us an account of her four degrees of prayer. "The first is Simple Mental Prayer,—fervent, inward, self-withdrawn; not exclusive of some words, nor unaided by what the mystics called discursive acts, etc., the consideration of facts and doctrines prompting to devotion. In this species there is nothing extraordinary. No mysticism, so far.

Second Degree: The Prayer of Quiet called also Pure Contemplation. In this state the Will is absorbed, though the Understanding and memory may still be active in an ordinary way. Thus the nun may be occupied for a day or two in the usual religious services, in embroidering an altar-cloth, or dusting a chapel; yet without the Will being engaged. That faculty is supposed to be, as it were, bound and taken up in God. This state is a supernatural one. Those who are conscious of it are to beware lest they suffer the unabsorbed faculties to trouble them. Yet they should not exert themselves to protract this 'recollection.' They should receive the wondrous sweetness as it comes, and enjoy it while it lasts, absolutely passive and tranquil. The devotee thus favored often dreads to move a limb, lest bodily exertion should mar the tranquility of the soul. But happiest are those who, as in the case just mentioned, can be Marys and Marthas at the same time.

Third Degree: The Prayer of Union, called also Perfect Contemplation. In this prayer, not the Will only, but the Understanding and Memory also, are swallowed up in God. These powers are not absolutely inactive, but we do not work them, nor do we know how they work. It is a kind of celestial frenzy—"a sublime madness," says Theresa. In such a transport she composed her ecstatic hymn, without the least exercise of the understanding on her part. At

¹ See also J. H. Leuba: *Tendances Fondamentales des Mystiques Chrétians*, Rev. Phil., July, 1902.

this stage the contemplatist neither thinks nor feels as a human being. The understanding is stunned and struck dumb with amazement. The heart knows neither why it loves, nor what. All the functions of the mind are suspended. Nothing is seen, heard, or known. And wherefore this sudden blank? That for a brief space (which seems almost shorter than it really is) the living God may, as it were, take the place of the unconscious spirit—that a divine vitality may for a moment hover about the dead soul, and then vanish without a trace; restoring the mystic to humanity again, to be heartened and edified, perhaps for years to come, by the vague memory of that glorious nothingness.

Some simple nun might ask, ‘how do you know that God did so plenarily enter into you, if you were conscious of nothing whatever?’

‘My daughter,’ replied the Saint, ‘I know it by an infallible certainty that God alone bestows.’

Fourth Degree: The Prayer of Rapture or Ecstasy. This state is the most privileged, because the most unnatural of all. The bodily as well as mental powers are sunk in a divine stupor. You can make no resistance, as you may possibly, to some extent, in the Prayer of the Union. On a sudden your breath and strength begin to fail; the eyes are involuntarily closed, or, if open, cannot distinguish surrounding objects; the hands are rigid; the whole body cold.”¹

She likens these four degrees of prayer to the four ways of watering the soul-garden. “Our soul,” she says, “is like a garden, rough and unfruitful, out of which God plucks the weeds, and plants flowers, which we have to water by prayer. There are four ways of doing this: First, by drawing the water from a well; this is the earliest and most laborious process. Secondly, by a water-wheel, which has its rim hung round with little buckets. Third, by causing a stream to flow through it. Fourth, by rain from heaven.”² In the last method the care of the garden is given over entirely to God, while we remain perfectly passive. While perplexed over the difficulty of adequately expressing this state she heard the voice of the Lord saying,

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 168 f.

² Inge: *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 220.

“She (the soul) unmakes herself, my daughter, to bring herself closer to Me. It is no more she that lives but I. As she cannot comprehend what she sees, understanding she ceases to understand.” This is Quietism of the deepest dye; as blank as that for which Molinos, her follower, had to die in a dungeon, and Fenelon and Mme. Guyon, were condemned and cruelly persecuted.

Of ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS, her friend and fellow-workman, we shall here give only his account of the mystical journey of the soul to the Divine union through three stages of Night. In the First Night the senses and desires are lulled to sleep by ascetic means. “One desire only doth God allow—that of obeying Him, and carrying the Cross.” “When thou dwellest upon anything, thou hast ceased to cast thyself upon the All.” “If thou will keep anything with the All, thou hast not thy treasure simply in God.” “Empty thy spirit of all created things, and thou wilt walk in the Divine light, for God resembles no created thing.”¹

In the Second Night, or the Night of the Spirit, the darkness is much blacker, in fact it is the deepest darkness to be experienced. The sufferings of the body and soul are unbearable. “You seem to descend, God-abandoned, alive into Hell. Make no resistance; utter no cry for comfort. Solace is a Tantalus’ bough, which will wave itself away as you stretch forth your hand. Acquiesce in all: be in your desertion as absolutely passive as in your rapture. So, from the bright glassy edge and summit of this awful fall, you shoot down helpless, blind, and dizzy,—down through the surging cataract, among the giant vapor columns, amid the eternal roar, to awake at the boiling foot, and find that you yet live, in your tossing shallop, or rather, you no longer, for you yourself are dead—so much mere ballast in the bottom of the boat: a divine and winged Radiance has taken your place, who animates rather than steers, guiding, in your stead, by mysterious impulse.”² Indeed, so dead must the soul strive to become in this night that it must fly from all supernatural manifestations (visions, voices, etc.), “without examining whether they be good or evil,” for they may disturb the perfect sleep of the soul.

In the Third Night, Memory and Will perish. The soul

¹ Inge: *loc. cit.*, pp. 225.

² Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 187.

floats corpse-like on the waters of Lethe. The sense of time and space is lost; the feelings, the intellect, the emotions are dead; the personality has completely evaporated; in brief the patient is a perfect blank. But fortunately this complete annihilation is only transitory. The soul after passing through this state is regenerated and becomes one with God, and God one with it. Now the patient becomes infallible for he is no longer human, but divine.—Such is the teaching of his “Mount Carmel” and the “Obscure Night.”

This great, mad mystic and ascetic travelled the negative road to its very end without even once glancing to the right or left. The world to him was a long, dark vestibule through which he hurried as rapidly as possible to his God. Grim death had no terror for him. It was rather a much desired boon, a means to a happy end, and in this respect he was not unlike many other mystics who lived to die and died to live.

There are at least three great Quietists, MIGUEL DE MOLINOS, FENELON, and MME. GUYON. But these need not detain us as their quietism, though more temperate and perfect, is very similar to that of St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross. We have not yet passed from the negative and morbidly introspective mysticism of the Roman Church, but when we return to Germany again we find that a marvellous change has taken place since the days of Taufer. Evidences of Luther's presence and activity meet us on every hand. The Roman Church lies a moulderling ruin, over which Protestantism proudly rears its head; the Bible has been translated into German, and its teachings made the common property of all, the lowest as well as the highest; the doctrine of justification by faith has been preached and accepted; and the Scriptures, instead of the Schoolmen or the Church, have become the standard of Christianity. The new mystical weeds which have just sprung up—Carlstadt, Sebastian Frank, Schwenkenfeld, Weigel, Storch, Thomas, Stübner, Münzer, and others have been crushed under foot, and the road to truth is clear once more. But the seeds of mysticism are very fertile, and can accommodate themselves to almost any soil and climate. We would naturally expect the birth of Protestantism to be the death of Mysticism, but it was not so. Old mysticism was dead, but its soul transmigrated into a higher form, known as Protestant or positive mysticism. The Theopath became Theosoph. The Catho-

lic mystic, as we have seen, endeavored, by unmaking or annihilating himself, to return to the source from which he sprang through sin. The world was a prison house; and everything in it—his body, relatives, friends, etc., were mere chains and bars which prevented him from returning to his God. God was the great All, everything else was nothing, or sin, which is worse than nothing. The highest knowledge was absolute ignorance; the greatest truth, a perfect blank. The Protestant mystic, on the other hand, endeavored to attain the same end by opposite means; by enlarging and expanding his self to the fullest possible extent, so that it could sympathize, be in harmony with, and understand all things in nature from “the little flower in the cranny wall” to the countless stars which twinkle so mysteriously in the firmament above. The world is not a filthy, loathsome dungeon, but the beautiful temple and garden of God, in which he dwells, and in which He has lovingly placed us to share His delights with Him. Everything is pregnant with His Divine Spirit, and the more objects and creatures we love and understand, and are *en rapport* with, the more of God have we in our souls. God is to be found, not by escaping from the world, but by entering into it with our whole soul. Knowledge is not ignorance, but Divine wisdom, and truth instead of being a cipher is the very fullness of the universe. The world, said Paracelsus, was his book, whose leaves were continents and seas, whose paragraphs were provinces, and whose letters were plants, stones, and the living things of every clime.

The difference between the two is, therefore, a difference of view point and method. Both have the same object in view, both yearn after union with God, but they travel in opposite directions and in different vehicles, so to speak.

In the sudden intoxicating rush for knowledge, however, flighty imagination, and not calm reason, took the lead. It has always been thus—poetry precedes philosophy and science, astrology astronomy, alchemy chemistry, and so on. And this is true in particular as well as in general. Evolution repeats itself, more or less rapidly and abbreviatedly in every new era of advancement. In the era of which we are now writing, subtle fancy had to have her play before sober truth could be arrived at. The old conceit of Plotinus, that the universe was a huge living organism with a kind of sym-

pathetic system of which man was the heart, was revived and still further elaborated by the Theosophists. Alchemists, Astrologers, Magicians, and Theurgists sprang up like mushrooms, and were consulted by emperors and nobles as well as by peasant women. The mental condition of the times was as irrational and chaotic, but with more excuse, as it is to-day among the believers in Christian Science, Telepathy, Spiritualism, Clairvoyance, and all the other countless 'isms.' The Cabbalists, anticipating our Mediums, conversed frequently with the spirits of the great dead, sometimes with the potentates of heaven, and discoursed fluently on the nature and character of God; the Theosophists maintained that man was a small edition of the universe, a microcosm, containing within him a miniature copy of everything in the macrocosm, and therefore, he who understood man perfectly, knew the outlines, at least, of all that there was to be known of God and the universe; the psychologists told their credulous hearers that man drew his life from the sun, that mental and physical development was determined by the moon, that imagination was the gift of Mercury, anger the curse of Mars, and so on 'ad libitum.' A few quotations from PARACELSUS, who, compared with the other mystics of his day, must be regarded as a great reformer, will show the state of scientific thought of this period.

"All things—even metals, stones, and meteors—have sense and imagination, and a certain 'fiducial' knowledge of God in them.

"The arctic pole draws water by its axle tree, and these waters break forth again at the axle tree of the antarctic pole.

"Earthquakes and thunder are the work of demons or angels.

"The lightnings without thunder are, as it were, the falling flowers of the 'aestival' stars.

"Hail and snow are the fruits of the stars, proceeding from them as flowers and blossoms from herb or tree.

"Night is, in reality, brought on by the influence of *dark stars*, which ray out darkness, as the others light.

"The moon, planets, and stars, are of the same quality with the lustrous precious stones of our earth, and of such a nature, that wandering spirits of the air see in them things to come, as in a magic mirror; and hence their gift of prophecy.

"In addition to the terrestrial, man has a sidereal body, which stands in connection with the stars. When, as in sleep, this sidereal body is more free than usual from the elements, it holds converse with the stars, and may acquire a knowledge of future events."¹

Of all the theosophists, none are so famous or more original than the queer little Görlitz shoemaker JACOB BOEHME or BEHMEN, around whom philosophers and savants flocked to learn the secrets of the Great Unknown. Possessed of a temperament similar to Geo. Fox's, he early found the bareness and coldness of the teachings of the clergy, their bigotry, servility, and licentiousness extremely repugnant to him. Protestantism had already degenerated, and Luther and Melanchthon were quoted as infallible authorities on all scriptural questions. The Articles of Faith superseded the Bible itself. Freedom of thought was again a thing of the past. The free and mystical spirit of Boehme could not rest content under such conditions. Bible in hand he wandered about in a melancholy mood, and was made still more miserable by the bitter contentions among the clergy, and the sinful lives of the laity. He sought hard for the truth which would give peace to his troubled soul. At last his prayer was answered from on high, as he believed. One day, in his twenty-fifth year, *as he sat gazing abstractedly on the dazzling light reflected from a tin vessel*, he fell into a trance which lasted seven days, and in which the mystery of creation, of the Trinity, and all the secrets of nature were revealed to him. Ten years later he fell into another trance in which he saw with perfect clearness all that was dim and confused in the former. To guard against forgetting anything which had been revealed to him, he jotted down his impressions as rapidly as he could. The result was "a disjointed, ungrammatical, and unreadable book," which he called the *Aurora*.

In the following letter written to his friend, Caspar Linder, twenty-one years later, he gives an account of his vision, of his writing the *Aurora*, its fate, etc.

"I saw and knew the Being of all Beings, the Byss (Grund) and the Abyss (Abgrund): also the birth of the Holy Trinity; the origin and primal state of this world, and of all creatures through the Divine Wisdom. I knew

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 70.

and saw in myself all the three worlds,—*i. e.* (1), the divine angelic or paradisiacal world; (2) the dark world as the original of nature, as to the fire; and (3) this external visible world, as a creation and outbirth, or as a substance spoken forth out of the two inner spiritual worlds. Moreover, I saw and had cognizance of the whole Being in good and in evil—how each had its origin in the other, and how the Mother did bring forth;—and this all moved me not merely to the height of wonder, but made me to rejoice exceedingly.

“Soon it came strongly into my mind that I should set the same down in writing, for a memorial, albeit I could hardly compass the understanding thereof in my external man, so as to write it on paper. I felt that with such great mysteries I must set to work as a child that goes to school. In my inward man I saw it well, as in a great deep, for I saw right through as into a chaos in which everything lay wrapped, but the unfolding thereof I found impossible.

“Yet from time to time it opened itself within me, as in a growing plant. For the space of twelve years I carried it about within me—was, as it were, pregnant therewith, feeling a mighty inward impulse, before I could bring it forth in any external form; till afterwards it fell upon me like a bursting shower that hitteth wheresoever it lighteth, as it will. So it was with me, and whatsoever I could bring into outwardness that I wrote down.

“Thereafter the sun shone on me a good while, yet not steadily and without interval, and when that light had withdrawn itself I could scarce understand my own work. And this was to show man that his knowledge is not his own, but God’s, and that God in man’s soul knoweth what and how he will.” He entrusted his writing to a friend and saw nothing more of it until three years later when some learned men sent him copies of it and exhorted him not to bury his talent. “To this counsel my outward reason was in no wise willing to agree, having suffered so much already. My reason was very weak and timorous at that time, the more so as the light of grace had then been withdrawn from me some while, and did but smoulder within, like a hidden fire. So I was filled with trouble. Without was contempt, within, a fiery driving; and what to do I knew not, till the breath of the Most High came to my help again, and awoke within me a new life. Then it was that I attained to a better style

of writing, likewise to a deeper and more thorough knowledge. I could reduce all better to outward form—as, indeed, my book concerning The Threefold Life through the Three Principles doth fully show, and as the godly reader whose heart is opened will see.

“ So, therefore, I have written, not from book learning, or the doctrine and science of men, but from my own book which was opened within me,—the book of the glorious image of God, which it was vouchsafed to me to read : ‘t is therein I have studied—as a child in its mother’s house, that sees what its father doth, and mimics the same in its child’s play. I need no other book than this.

“ My book has but three leaves—the three principles of Eternity. Therein I find all that Moses and the prophets, Christ and his apostles have taught. Therein I find the foundation of the world and all mystery,—yet not I but the spirit of the Lord doth it, in such measure as he pleaseth.

“ For hundreds of times have I prayed Him that if my knowledge were not for His glory and the edifying of my brethren, he will take it from me, only keeping me in His love. But I have found that with all my earnest entreaty the fire within me did but burn the more, and it is in this glow, and in this knowledge that I have produced my works.

. . . Let no man conceive of me more highly than he here seeth, for the work is none of mine ; I have it only in that measure vouchsafed me of the Lord ; I am but his instrument wherewith He doeth what He will. This, I say, my dear friend, once for all, that none may seek in me one other than I am, as though I were a man of high skill and intellect, whereas I live in weakness and childhood, and the simplicity of Christ. In that child’s work which He hath given me is my pastime and my play ; ‘t is there I have my delight, as in a pleasure garden where stand many glorious flowers ; therewith will I make myself glad awhile, till such time as I regain the flowers of Paradise in the new man.”¹

The nature of Boehme’s trance was, perhaps, predetermined by the writings of SCHWENKFELD, WEIGEL, and PARACELSUS, with which he was acquainted. From Weigel he learns to “ withdraw into himself and await, in total passivity, the incoming of the Divine Word, whose light rewards unto the babe what is hidden from the wise

¹Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 83-86.

and prudent. By the same writer he is reminded that he lives in God, and taught that if God also dwell in him, then is he even here in Paradise—the state of regenerate souls. Paracelsus extols the power of faith to penetrate the mysteries of nature, and shows him how a plain man, with his Bible only, if he be filled with the Spirit and carried out of himself by divine communication, may seem to men a fool, but is in truth more wise than all the doctors. Weigel says that man, as body, soul, and spirit, belongs to three worlds—the terrestrial, the astral, and the celestial. Both Weigel and Paracelsus teach him the doctrine of microcosm. They assure him that as divine illumination reveals to him the mysteries of his own being, he will discern proportionately the secrets of external nature. They teach that all language, art, science, handicraft, exist potentially in man; that all apparent acquisition from without is in reality a revival and evolution of that which is within.¹

But the most important heritage of all was the doctrine of Development by Contraries. "According to this theory, God manifests Himself in opposites. The peace of Unity develops itself into the strife of the Manifold. All things consist in Yea and Nay. The light must have shadow, day night, laughter tears, health sickness, hope fear, good evil, or they would not be what they are. Only by resistance, only in collision, is the spark of vitality struck out, is power realized, and progress possible."²

It is in this doctrine that Boehme finds his long sought for explanation of the source and being of evil. Evil, says Boehme now, is the contrary of good; without it we could not know the good. Good and evil are in all things, the angels and devils are both in God, both contend for the prize—the human soul—and the victor receives it. Without either combatant there could be no strife, no reward or punishment, no virtue, no vice, no life.

Starting with the fallacious premise that good and evil are complementary, he reaches conclusions which would be dear to the heart of every born criminal, and which he himself would be the first to reject. His explanation of man's relation to the universe he derives from Weigel. In man, he says, there are three gates open on the three worlds; the spiritual, sidereal, and terrestrial, which he intersects as a

¹ Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 90.

² Vaughan: *loc. cit.*, 2, pp. 92.

line from the centre to the outermost of three concentric circles. On this line he travelled back and forth. "When recipient of celestial truth he is near the centre; when he strives to give utterance and form to such intimations, he approaches the circumference."

His theory of the Trinity is that a desire springs forth from the abyss of the Godhead, which is the Father. The object and realization of the desire is the Son, and "the bond and result of this reciprocal love is the Holy Spirit." His description of the seven "Forms of Life," or "Active Principles," or "Fountain Spirits," or "Mothers of Existence;" and his account of creation are quite novel and interesting, but these need not detain us.

Of the conflicting estimates both of the man and his teaching, we have already spoken in the beginning of this chapter. His mysticism was of the primitive type—a product of some nervous disturbance, but it was colored by the teachings of more philosophical mystics. Certain it is, that he supplied a great need in his day, as is seen from the facts that his works were very widely circulated, and he himself held in the highest esteem by the learned of the land. His best known English disciple and exponent is WM. LAW.

Hitherto we have dealt with mystics who were vouchsafed only a few glimpses into the spirit world, and still fewer interviews with their Lord, or some of the angels. Now we have to mention one who, for nearly thirty years of his earthly life, was a constant visitor to the Heavenly Kingdom and a friend of its inhabitants.

SWEDENBORG, unlike Boehme, gives us accurate and minute accounts of the characters, lives, and customs of the beings with whom he has lived on the most familiar and neighborly terms the greater portion of his life. According to his own testimony, he understood and could use the language of the inhabitants of the other world; he frequently visited their schools, churches, libraries, and homes: was on many occasions the honored guest of a social gathering, and not infrequently gave instruction to the simple-minded angels concerning the sinful and deceitful creatures of this world.

"I have been called to a holy office," he writes in one of his letters, "by the Lord Himself, who most graciously manifested himself to me, his servant, in the year 1743,

when He opened my sight to a view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with the spirits, and angels, which I enjoy to this day. From that time, I began to print and publish various *arcana* that have been seen by me, or revealed to me; as respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word, with many other most important matters conducive to salvation and true wisdom." Again, in the preface to his "*Arcana Coelestia*," he writes: "Of the Lord's divine mercy, it has been granted me now for several years to be constantly and uninterruptedly in company with spirits and angels, hearing them converse with each other, and conversing with them. Hence it has been permitted me to hear and see stupendous things in the other life, which have never before come to the knowledge of any man, nor entered his imagination. I have there been instructed concerning different kinds of spirits, and the state of souls after death; concerning hell, or the lamentable state of the unfaithful; concerning heaven, or the most happy state of the faithful; and particularly concerning the doctrine of faith which is acknowledged throughout all heaven."

But already in his childhood, from his fourth to his tenth year, he often revealed things in his discourse which filled his parents with astonishment, and made them declare at times, that certainly the angels spoke through his mouth.¹

Like St. Theresa, Geo. Fox, and Geo. Sand, his early thoughts turned upon religious topics. "From my sixth to my twelfth year," he writes, "it was my greatest delight to converse with the clergy concerning faith; to whom I often observed, that charity or love is the life of faith; and that this vivifying charity or love is no other than the love of one's neighbor; that God vouchsafes this faith to every one: but that it is adopted by those only who practice that charity."²

He came of sturdy Norse stock, and was gifted with a powerful mind which anticipated many important discoveries of later centuries in mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, and anatomy. He lived a pure, serene, and scholarly life, had the widest interests, and was in every respect an in-

¹ See Wm. White: *Life and Writings of Swedenborg*.

² Wm. White: *loc. cit.*, p. 28.

spiring and estimable character. Though a scientist of the first rank, he is principally known to the world as a religious mystic, and as such the opinions concerning him are conflicting. He has both been praised as one who "is not to be measured by whole colleges of ordinary scholars," and derided as a mere madman. There is, however, much truth in Tennemann's statement: "If he must needs be mad, there is a rare method in his madness; and if the world insists on his being a visionary it must admit that his visions are something anomalous, in their systematic and mathematical form."¹

We confess we have no faith in his Seership, that we cannot help believing that his visions were the product of some peculiar mental aberration of long standing. Indeed, we are told that from his early childhood, "when on his knees at prayer, and afterwards when engaged in profound meditation, he found that his natural respiration was for the time suspended." However, in view of the recent pains-taking researches of the Psychical Research Society, we can no longer, whatever our individual bias may be, brush him or his works aside with a smile or a sneer. Like Spinoza, he was a sincere, courageous, God-intoxicated man, and to compare him with our modern, money-making mystics and spiritualists is, we might almost say, to commit sacrilege.

It is impossible here to outline or epitomize his religious writings which cover more than two score large volumes, but the following extracts from his work entitled *Heaven and Hell*, considered one of his most charming productions, will give the reader some conception of the nature of the entire work and enable him to judge of the sanity of the man and the value of his teachings.

The title page reads: "Heaven and its Wonders, the World of Spirits, and Hell; being a relation of things heard and seen." Heaven, the World of Spirits, and Hell are the three great regions, he tells us, into which the spiritual world is divided. Heaven is the Divine Sphere of the Lord. This Divine Sphere is love to him and charity towards our neighbor. There are three Heavens consisting of innumerable societies of angels; every society is a heaven on a smaller scale, and every angel is a heaven in miniature. The whole heaven, viewed collectively, is in form as one man,

¹ Manual of the History of Philosophy.

and every angel has a perfect human form. There is a close correspondence between all things belonging to Heaven, *i. e.*, the spiritual world, and all things belonging to man and earth, *i. e.*, the natural world. Things in the natural world exist and subsist from their prototypes in the spiritual world.

“ Since heaven, as a whole, resembles one man, and is, also, a Divine spiritual man in the greatest form, even with respect to shape, it necessarily has the same distinctions, as to members and parts, as man has, bearing similar names. The angels also know in what member this or the other society is situated; which they express by saying that this society is in the member, or in some province of the head—that, in the member, or in some province of the loins; and so with respect to the others. In general, the supreme or third heaven composes the head as far as the neck; the middle or second heaven composes the breast or body to the loins and knees; and the ultimate or first heaven composes the legs and feet down to the soles; and also the arms down to the fingers; for the arms and hands are parts of the ultimates of man, though placed on the sides. Hence, again, it is evident why there are three heavens.

“ That angels are human forms or men, I have seen a thousand times; for I have conversed with them as one man does with another, sometimes with one alone and sometimes with many in company; nor did I ever see in them anything differing, as to their form, from man. I have sometimes wondered at finding them such; and lest it should be objected that I was deceived by some fallacy or some visionary fancy, it has been granted to me to see them when I was wide awake, or when all my bodily senses were in activity, and I was in a state to perceive everything clearly. I have also frequently told them that men in the Christian world are in such gross ignorance respecting angels and spirits, as to suppose them to be minds without a form, or mere thoughts, of which they had no other idea than as something ethereal possessing a vital principle; and as they thus attribute to them nothing belonging to man except a faculty of thinking, they imagine that they cannot see, being without eyes; nor hear, being without ears; nor speak, having neither mouth nor tongue.”

“ It has also been granted me to see an angel of the innermost heaven. His face was more bright and resplendent than those of the angels of the lower heavens. I examined

him, and I can declare that he had the human form in its utmost perfection."

" Since man is both a heaven and a world in miniature, formed after the image of heaven and the world at large, he, also, has belonging to him both a spiritual world and a natural world. The interiors, which belong to his mind and have relation to his understanding and will, constitute his spiritual world ; but his exteriors, which belong to his body, and have references to its senses and actions, constitute his natural world. Whatever, therefore, exists in his natural world, that is in his body, with its senses and actions, by derivation from his spiritual world, that is from his mind, with his understanding and will, is called its correspondent."

" In the Grand Man, who is heaven, they that are stationed in the head are in the enjoyment of every good above all others ; for they are in the enjoyment of love, peace, innocence, wisdom, and intelligence ; and thence of joy and happiness. These have an influx into the head, and whatever appertains to the head with man, and corresponds thereto. In the Grand Man, who is heaven, they that are stationed in the breast, are in the enjoyment of the good of charity and faith : their influx, also, with man, is into the breast, to which they correspond. But in the Grand Man, or heaven, they that are stationed in the loins, and in the organs belonging to generation therewith connected, are they who are eminently grounded in conjugal love. They who are stationed in the feet are grounded in the ultimate good of heaven, which is called spiritual-natural good. They who are in the arms and hands are in the power of truth derived from good. They who are in the eyes are those eminent for understanding. They who are in the ears are in attention and obedience. They in the nostrils, are those distinguished for perception. They in the mouth and tongue, are such as excel in discoursing from understanding and perception. They in the kidneys, are such as are grounded in truth, of a searching, distinguishing and castigatory character. They in the liver, pancreas, and spleen are grounded in the purification of good and truth by various methods. So with those in the other members and organs. All have an influx into the similar parts of man, and correspond to them. The influx of heaven takes place into the functions and uses of the members ; and their uses, being from the spiritual world, invest themselves with forms by means of such mate-

rials as are found in the material world and present themselves in effects. Hence there is a correspondence between them." In sections 108-111 he tells us that the instincts and activities of bees, caterpillars, the fowls of the air, the animals, and the development of minute seeds into trees which bear fruit—all these things proceed from the spiritual world in which exist their prototypes. . . ."

"The Lord appears as a sun, not in heaven, but far above the heavens; nor yet overhead, or in the zenith, but before the faces of the angels in a medium altitude. He appears at a great distance in two situations, one before the right eye and the other before the left. Before the right eye He appears exactly like a sun, as if by the same sort of fire, and of the same magnitude as the sun of this world; but before the left eye He does not appear as a sun but as a moon, of similar but more brilliant whiteness, and of a similar magnitude with the moon of our earth, etc." . . . Angels pass through changes of state for three reasons, chief of which is to break the monotony. "The First (reason) is that the enjoyment of life and of heaven which they experience, resulting from the love and wisdom which they receive from the Lord, would by degrees be thought little of did they abide in it continually; as is experienced by those who are perpetually surrounded by delightful and agreeable objects without variety."

Angels wear clothes which correspond to their intelligence, that is, the higher the intelligence, the brighter the color of the clothes. In the inmost heaven, however, the angels are naked. "The garments of the angels do not merely appear as garments, but are such in reality. This is evident from these circumstances: that they not only see them but also feel them; that they possess many of them; that they put them off and put them on; and that when they are not in use they lay them by, and, when in use, they take them again. That they wear different dresses, I have witnessed a thousand times. I inquired whence they obtained them, and they told me from the Lord; that they receive them as gifts, and that they sometimes are clothed with them, without knowing themselves how it has been done."

Angels have dwellings and mansions. "Whenever I have orally conversed with the angels, I have been with them in their habitations. These are exactly like the habitations on earth which are called houses, but more beautiful.. They

contain chambers, with drawing rooms, and bed chambers in great numbers: they have courts to them, and are encompassed with gardens, flower beds, and fields. Where the angels live together in societies, the habitations are contiguous, one adjoining another, and arranged in the form of a city, with streets, roads, and squares, exactly like the cities on our earth. It has been granted me to walk through them, and to look about on all sides, and occasionally to enter the houses. This occurred to me when wide awake, my interior sight being open at the time." These cities and societies are ruled by governors; the homes have masters and obedient servants.

"The angels of each heaven do not dwell all together in one place, but are divided into larger and smaller societies, distant from each other according to the differences of the good of love and faith in which they are grounded, those who are grounded in similar good, forming one society. There is an infinite variety of kinds of good in the heavens; and every angel is such in quality, as is the good belonging to him."

"All angels who are of a similar quality associate with each other, and know each other though they may never have met before. "I have seen some (angels) who appeared to have been known to me from infancy whilst others seemed not known to me at all; those whom I appeared to know were such as were in a state similar to that of my spirit; but those whom I did not know were such whose state was dissimilar." Intercommunication between the societies is established by means of intermediate angels. The societies are of different sizes, "the larger consist of myriads of angels, the smaller of several thousands, and the smallest of some hundreds."

The angels go to church and hear sermons by preachers appointed by the Lord. He describes the outward appearance of the heavenly temples and their interior arrangement. He also gives a conversation he had with one of the preachers concerning the state of sanctity.

The spiritual angels use in writing letters like our common Roman type; while the celestial angels use a sort of Arabic or Hebrew alphabet. "There was once sent to me from Heaven a bit of paper, on which were only written a few words in Hebrew characters; and it was stated that every letter involved arcana of wisdom, these being contained in

the inflections and curvatures of the letters, and thence also in the sounds. It hence was made evident to me what is meant by these words of the Lord: "Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." (Math. 5:18.)

His explanation of "the origin of the anxiety, grief of mind, and interior sadness, called melancholy," is quite amusing. "There are certain spirits," he says, "who are not yet in conjunction with hell, being as yet in their first state. . . . They love undigested and malignant substances such as those of food when it lies corrupting in the stomach. They consequently are present where such substances are to be found in man, because these are delightful to them: and they there converse with one another from their own evil affection. The affection contained in their discourse thence enters the man by influx; and if it is opposed to the man's affection, he experiences melancholy, sadness, and anxiety; whereas, if it agrees with his affection, he becomes gay and cheerful. Those spirits appear near the stomach, some to the left and some to the right, some below and some above, with different degrees of proximity and remoteness; thus they take various stations, according to their affections which form their character. That such is the origin of anxiety of mind has been granted me to know and be assured of by much experience; I have seen those spirits, I have heard them, I have felt the anxieties arising from them, and I have conversed with them, they were driven away, and my anxiety ceased; they returned, and it returned; and I was sensible of its increase and decrease according to their approximation and removal. Hence was made manifest to me the origin of the persuasion entertained by some, who do not know what conscience is by reason that they have none, when they attribute its pangs to a disordered state of the stomach."

All children, those of wicked parents as well as those of pious ones, go to heaven and gradually develop into angels. Death makes no immediate change in the condition of the individuals; infants, children, youths, middle-aged men, and old men are such when they enter the other world, but afterwards they are changed. As soon as infants reach heaven, which is immediately after their decease, they are delivered to the care of angels of the female sex—governesses, who in this world tenderly loved infants. Later they

are transferred to another heaven, where they are instructed by masters. And so they advance, and become model young men and women. "What a delightful faith is this!" cries Mr. White, one of his biographers. "Do not its beauty and rationality prove its truthfulness?"

He further tells us of the wise and the simple, the rich and the poor in heaven; of marriages, and the occupations of angels; of heavenly joy and happiness, and finally, of the immensity of heaven. The following are the paragraph captions of the remaining two sections of the book:

OF THE WORLD OF SPIRITS, AND OF THE STATE OF MAN AFTER DEATH.

What the World of Spirits is; That as to his interiors, every man is a Spirit; Of man's resuscitation from the dead, and entrance into eternal life; That man after death is in perfect human form; That man after death is possessed of every sense, and of all the memory, thought, and affection that he had in the world; and that he leaves nothing behind him but his terrestrial body; That man, after death, is, in quality, such as his life had been in the world; That the delights of the life of every one are turned, after death, into correspondent ones; Of the first state of man after death; Of the third state of man after death; which is the state of instruction provided for those who go to heaven; That no one attains heaven by an act of immediate mercy; That it is not so difficult to live the life which leads to heaven as is commonly supposed.

OF HELL.

That the Lord governs the Hells; That no one is cast into Hell by the Lord; but that the spirit does it himself; That all the inhabitants of the Hells are immersed in evils, and in falsities thence proceeding, originating in self-love and the love of the world; What is meant by the fire of Hell, and what by the gnashing of teeth; Of the profound wickedness, and direful arts, of infernal spirits; Of the appearance, situation, and plurality of the hells; Of the equilibrium between heaven and hell; That man is in the enjoyment of freedom, through the equilibrium that is maintained between Heaven and Hell.

In a word, the other world corresponds both as a whole and in its smallest parts to our own, only that it is more beautiful and perfect.

If his description of heaven and hell appears to us naïve and childish, we recognize at the same time that it is bold, honest, and more logical and rational than the views entertained by the majority of believers in the Old and New Testaments. For these believe in immortality, in heaven and hell, and if they were honest with themselves and their religion they would confess that such a heaven and hell as Swedenborg has described is the kind that lurks in their subconsciousness and the kind they hope for and dread. For the gossamer-like shades of the departed, "composed of some sort of ethereal vapor," floating in clouds and singing psalms to eternity, in which they believe he gives them living, tangible, active, and self-conscious men, women, and children. His angels, too, are true Biblical angels, such as spoke with Abraham and Lot, and wrestled with Jacob. Likewise, his heaven and hell are orderly universes, and not the irrational 'tohoo vavohoos' of some Christians and Jews. From the artistic standpoint they are certainly superior to Milton's, Dante's, or Jonathan Edwards'.

In the words of Mr. White, "The general belief respecting the nature of life in heaven is so vague, and contains so much of clouds and psalm-singing, that it is not to be wondered at that some free and daring spirits should openly avow their preference for the more substantial realities of this life." And he may, perhaps, be excused for adding, "Let us be thankful that man's utmost wants, in this respect, are satisfied in the writings of that New Church which the Lord is now raising up, and of which Swedenborg was the divinely-appointed herald."¹

Again, if Swedenborgianism is a childish religion, it is as superior to the older forms of mysticism as a healthy child is superior to a decrepit and helpless general paralytic. The one may, perhaps, excite our good-natured laughter, but the other calls for our pity and tears. There is happily no morbid and vicious pessimism in his religion, no bitter misanthropy, no contempt for the world and all that sane men hold dear, no insane asceticism, no cruel lacerations of the body, no wild, Berserker rage, no longing for absolute ex-

¹ White: *Life and Writings of Swedenborg*, p. 108

tinction. Children, according to Swedenborg, are not the abominable, depraved creatures Calvin would have us believe, nor are they, as the Rev. Hammond tells us, little vipers; on the contrary, they are precisely what parents and lovers of children think they are—little angels. And men and women are not all hideous devils reeking in filth and sin; they are the children of the Grand Man, the Divine Humanity, who loves them with the tenderness of a father, and some of them at least are not far removed from the celestial beings who never tire singing the praises of the Lord, and doing his will. Man instead of being demonized is thus deified. There is no unjust predestination theory in his writings; all men are free to win either heaven or hell; they reap what they have sown, and this is, of course, the highest justice as well as an inexorable law of evolution. Our earth is not a foul dungeon whose fruits are poisonous weeds; nor is it a mere mirage. Our earth and the other planets are mirrors in which God reflects His glory. Like the rings in Lessing's "*Nathan der Weise*" they are so like the original, the beautiful abode of God, that it is almost impossible to distinguish between them. And so we might go on and point out the many superiorities of this new religion over the old inhuman and unnatural ones. But this is all that we can say for it. It is infinitely better than some of the religions we have considered, but it is not a religion which is likely to appeal to the multitude of healthy-minded, fully-developed adults. Those who subscribe to Swedenborgianism show but little religious development beyond the stage reached by primitive and very ancient peoples.

That mysticism can thrive in almost any environment is evident from the fact that even pragmatic and phlegmatic England has given birth to several mystics both in religion and in poetry. Among religious mystics we find such names as WALTER HILTON and JULIANA OF NORWICH, both belonging to the Middle Ages. The latter, like many of the other mystics, was favored with a series of revelations in which she both saw and conversed with her Lord. For a long time she had yearned for a "bodily sight" of the Crucified Jesus "like others that were Christ's lovers," and prayed for a grievous sickness almost unto death, which she hoped would remove her farther from the world and bring her nearer to God. Her prayers were answered. She fell sick, and in what were believed to be her

dying moments, she beheld the living Christ in the crucifix held before her. After that she had frequent visions.

In later times we meet with GEO. FOX, WM. LAW, the disciple of Boehme, JOHN SMITH, WHICHCOTE, CUDWORTH, CULVERWEL, and among the poets there are WORDSWORTH, BROWNING, TENNYSON, KINGSLEY, whose mystical poems are familiar to all.

The early life of GEO. FOX, the founder of the Society of Friends or Quakers, was, as has already been said, strikingly like that of Jacob Boehme. He describes himself as "knowing pureness and righteousness at eleven years of age." Vice and moral laxity were always odious to him, and caused him much mental suffering. "He fasted much, and walked abroad in solitary places. Taking his Bible, he sat in hollow trees or secluded spots, and often at night he walked alone in silent meditation." At one time he fell into a death-like trance which lasted fourteen days, after which "his sorrow began to abate, and with brokenness of heart and tears of joy he acknowledged the infinite love of God." Writing of the spiritual experiences in his twenty-fourth year he says: "Now was I come up in spirit, through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new; and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter. I knew nothing but pureness and innocence and righteousness, being renewed up into the image of God by Christ Jesus; so that I say I was come up to the state of Adam which he was in before he fell. The creation was opened to me, and it was showed me how all things had their names given them, according to their nature and virtue. And I was at a stand in my mind whether I should practice physic for the good of mankind, seeing the nature and virtues of the creatures were so opened to me by the Lord. But I was immediately taken up in spirit to see into another or more steadfast state than Adam's in innocence, even into a state in Christ Jesus, that should never fall. And the Lord showed me that such as were faithful to Him in the power and light of Christ, should come up into that state in which Adam was before he fell; in which the admirable works of creation, and the virtues thereof may be known, through the openings of that divine word of wisdom and power by which they were made. Great things did the Lord lead me into, and wonderful depths were opened unto me, beyond what can by words be

declared ; but as people come into subjection to the Spirit of God, and grow up in the image and power of the Almighty, they may receive the word of wisdom that opens all things, and come to know the hidden unity in the Eternal Being.”¹

The anecdotes told of his wonderful prophetic, clairvoyant, and healing powers are as interesting and as authenticated as those told of Swedenborg. The etiology of his mysticism, like that of Boehme’s, was the bitter disappointment over the inability of religious teachers and scholars to administer relief to him in his temptations to despair. After travelling seven miles to a priest of reputed experience at Tamworth, he found him, he tells us, “but like an empty hollow cask.” So, too, he tells us, were all who regarded churches as holy, and identified church-going with religion. ‘Steeple-houses’ are a sinful innovation, diffusing for the most part darkness rather than light. All formalism was not only useless but abominable. There is a Universal Light in men, given to them by God, which will shine only when they still the distractions of their senses, and withdraw within themselves, silently waiting for the manifestations of the divine presence. These manifestations he held were perceptible in violent quakings of the body. It is from this fact that his followers were nicknamed Quakers.

In Browning’s *The Last Ride Together* we have an excellent description of one who has begun to climb the Ladder of Perfection but wants the courage to continue. He clearly recognizes the vanity of life and all its strivings, catches faint glimmerings of the great Beyond but dares not free his soul of its earthly frame and send it soaring in quest of its Affinity, about which he knows as yet too little.

Hush ! if you saw some western cloud
All billowy-bosomed, over-bowed
By many benedictions—sun’s
And moon’s and evening star’s at once—
And so, you, looking and loving best,
Conscious grew, your passion drew
Cloud, sunset, moonrise, star-shine too,
Down on you, near and yet more near,
Till flesh must fade for heaven was here:—
Thus leaned she and lingered—joy and fear!
Thus lay she a moment on my breast.

¹ *Journal*, Vol. 1, pp. 95.

*Then we began to ride. My soul
Smoothed itself out, a long-cramped scroll
Freshening and fluttering in the wind.
Past hopes already lay behind.
What need to strive with a life awry ?
Had I said that, had I done this,
So might I gain, so might I miss.
Might she have loved me ? just as well
She might have hated, who can tell !
Where had I been now if the worst befell ?
And here we are riding, she and I.*

*Fail I alone, in words and deeds ?
Why, all men strive and who succeeds ?
*We rode, it seemed my spirit flew,
Saw other regions, cities new,
As the world rushed by on either side.*
I thought,—All labor, yet no less
Bear up beneath their unsuccess.
*Look at the end of work, contrast
The petty done, the undone vast,
This present of theirs with the hopeful past !*
I hoped she would love me; here we ride.*

*What hand and brain went ever paired ?
What heart alike conceived and dared ?
What act proved all its thought had been ?
What will but felt the fleshy screen ?
We ride and I see her bosom heave.
There 's many a crown for who can reach.
Ten lines, a statesman's life in each !
The flag stuck on a heap of bones,
A soldier's doing ! what atones ?
They scratch his name on the Abbey stones.
My riding is better, by their leave.*

*What does it all mean, poet ? Well,
Your brains beat into rhythm, you tell
What we felt only; you expressed
You hold things beautiful the best,
And pace them in rhyme so, side by side.
'T is something, nay 't is much : but then,
Have you yourself what 's best for men ?
Are you—poor, sick, old ere your time—
Nearer one whit your own sublime
Than we who have never turned a rhyme !
Sing, riding's a joy ! For me, I ride.*

*And you, great sculptor—so, you gave
A score of years to Art, her slave,
And that 's your Venus, whence we turn
To yonder girl that fords the burn !
You acquiesce, and shall I repine ?
What, man of music, you grown gray
With notes and nothing else to say,
Is this your sole praise from a friend,
"Greatly his opera's strains intend,
But in music we know how fashions end !"
I gave my youth ; but we ride, in fine.*

Who knows what's fit for us? Had fate
 Proposed bliss here should sublimate
 My being—had I signed the bond—
Still one must lead some life beyond,
Have a bliss to die with, dim-descried.
This foot once planted on the goal,
This glory-garland round my soul,
Could I descry such? Try and test!
I sink back shuddering from the quest.
Earth being so good, would heaven seem best?
Now, heaven and she are beyond this ride.

And yet—she has not spoke so long!
 What if heaven be that, fair and strong
 At life's best, with our eyes upturned,
 Whither life's flower is first discerned,
 We, fixed so, ever should so abide?
 What if we still ride on, we two,
 With life forever old yet new,
 Changed not in kind but in degree,
 The instant made eternity,—
 And heaven just prove that I and she
 Ride, ride together, forever ride?¹

In Rabbi Ben Ezra he tells us,

“Then, welcome each rebuff
 That turns earth's smoothness rough,
 Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go!
 Be our joys three-parts pain!
 Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
 Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never
 Grudge the throe!

“For thence,—a paradox
 Which comforts while it mocks,—
 Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail;
 What I aspired to be,
 And was not, comforts me;
 A brute I might have been, but would not
 Sink i' the scale.

“What is he but a brute
 Whose flesh hath soul to suit,
 Whose spirit works lest arms and legs want play?
 To man, propose this test—
 Thy body at its best,
 How far can that project thy soul on its lone way?”

In other words, the very fact that our attainments fall far short of our aspirations proves the superiority of mind over matter, proves that somewhere there must be a higher and fuller life in which the soul, when released from the body, can satisfy all its desires. Tennyson describes a trance experience of his own in the *Ancient Sage*.

¹ The italics are mine.

"And more: my son! for more than once when I
 Sat all alone, revolving in myself
 The word that is the symbol of myself,
 The mortal limit of the Self was loosed,
 And passed into the Nameless, as a cloud
 Melts into Heaven. I touch'd my limbs, the limbs
 Were strange not mine—and yet no shade of doubt,
 But utter clearness, and thro' loss of Self
 The gain of such large life as match'd with ours
 Were Sun to spark—unshadowable in words,
 Themselves but shadows of a shadow-world."¹

And in the *Higher Pantheism* he gives expression to his Mysticism.

The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
 Are not these, O Soul, the Vision of Him who reigns?

Is not the Vision He? tho' He be not that which He seems?
 Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?

Earth, these solid stars, this weight of body and limb,
 Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him? . . .

Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
 Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet. . . .

And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
 But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were it not He?"

Tennyson was from very early life subject to trances. In a letter to a friend he writes: "I have never had any revelations through anaesthetics; but a kind of 'waking trance' (this for lack of a better word) I have frequently had quite up from boyhood when I have been all alone. This has often come upon me through repeating my own name to myself silently, till all at once as it were out of the intensity of the consciousness of individuality the individuality itself seemed to dissolve and fade away into boundless being—and this not a confused state but the clearest of the clearest, the surest of the surest, utterly beyond words—where death was an almost laughable impossibility—the loss of personality (if so it were) seeming no extinction but the only true life.

"I am ashamed of my feeble description. Have I not said the state is utterly beyond words? But in a moment when I come back to my normal state of 'sanity' I am ready to fight for *mein liebes Ich*, and hold that it will last for æons of æons."

The true poet, if he be also a philosopher, that is, a man

¹ See also *In Memoriam*, 95.

of intense feelings and powerful intellect, must almost of necessity be a mystic, for the combined effect of strong emotions and intellect is very apt to be philosophical mysticism. The heights which the man of pure intellect, the philosopher or scientist is unable to attain, the philosophical mystic reaches with the aid of his sublimated feelings.

“I found Him not in world or sun,
Or eagle’s wing, or insect’s eye ;
Nor through the questions men may try,
The petty cobwebs we have spun :

“If e’er, when faith had fall’n asleep,
I heard a voice, ‘Believe no more,’
And heard an ever breaking shore,
That tumbled in the Godless deep :

“A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason’s colder part,
And, like a man in wrath, the heart
Stood up, and answered, ‘*I have felt.*’”¹

Wordsworth, too, the supreme poet of divine Nature, enjoyed many a delightful hour in which his soul took flight and bathed itself in the infinite Soul of Nature. We can give only one quotation taken from his poem composed on revisiting the Wye.

“These beauteous forms,
Through a long absence, have not been to me
As is a landscape to a blind man’s eye ;
But oft, in lonely rooms, and ‘mid the din
Of towns and cities, I have owed to them,
In hours of weariness, sensations sweet,
Felt in the blood, and felt along the heart ;
And passing even into my purer mind,
With tranquil restoration :—feelings, too,
Of unremembered pleasure : such, perhaps,
As have no slight or trivial influence
On that best portion of a good man’s life,
His little, nameless, unremembered acts
Of kindness and of love. Nor less, I trust,
To them I may have owed another gift
Of aspect more sublime ; that blessed mood,
In which the burthen of the mystery,
In which the heavy and the weary weight
Of all this unintelligible world,
Is lightened :—that serene and blessed mood,
In which the affections gently lead us on,—
Until, the breath of this corporeal frame,
And even the motion of our human blood
Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
In body, and become a living soul :
While with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
We see into the life of things.”

¹ Tennyson : *In Memoriam*, 124. The italics are mine.

Our own America can boast of at least one genuine mystic. This is EMERSON, the incarnated soul of Faizi, the Persian Sufi, as he has been called. Like his forerunner, Emerson knew no creed or church. In religious matters he was a cosmopolitan, owing allegiance to no sect but loving the good in all. There is, however, a difference between Emerson and his Sufi brother. The latter assigned reality only to God, the former only to the mind of man ; the latter strove to lose humanity in Deity, the former dissolved Deity in humanity ; "the Persian aspired to reach a divinity above him by self-conquest ; the American seeks to realize a divinity within him by self will. Self-annihilation is the watchword of the one, self assertion that of the other."¹

"There is one mind common to all individual men," says Emerson. "Who hath access to their universal mind is a party to all that is or can be done, for this is the only sovereign agent." That he believed himself to have such access is clear from the lines already quoted :

"I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart, and Shakespeare's strain."

Like the Persian mystics, he brushes aside everything which would come between him and God. "The relations of the soul to the divine spirit are so pure that it is profane to seek to interpose helps. . . . Whenever a mind is simple, and receives a divine wisdom, the old things pass away, —means, teachers, texts, temples, fall ; it lives now and absorbs past and future into the present hour."²

Speaking of Intuition and the height to which it raises men, he says : "Fear and hope are alike beneath it. It asks nothing. There is something low even in hope. We are then in vision. There is nothing that can be called gratitude, nor properly joy. The soul is raised over passion," etc. So, again : "Prayer as a means to effect a private end is theft and meanness. It supposes dualism in nature and consciousness. As soon as man is at one with God he will not beg. He will then see prayer in all action."³ His belief in complete identity with the oversoul

¹ Vaughan : 2, p. 9.

² Emerson's Essays (1848), p. 35. Quoted by Vaughan.

³ Emerson's Essays, p. 37, 42. Quoted by Vaughan.

and transcendence of time and space is brought out in the following sentence. "We live in succession, in division, in parts, in particles. Meantime within man is the soul of the whole, the wise silence, the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related,—the external ONE. And this deep power in which we exist, and whose beatitude is all accessible to us, is not only self-sufficing and perfect every hour, but the act of seeing and the thing seen, the seer and the spectacle, the subject and the object, are one." And again: "Time and space are but inverse measures of the force of the soul. A man is capable of abolishing them both. The spirit sports with time :

"Can crowd eternity into an hour,
Or stretch an hour into eternity."¹

Man, by apprehending God, grows into an organ of the Universal Soul. "The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God; yet forever and ever the influx of this better and universal self is new and unsearchable." Again: "I, the imperfect, adore my own Perfect. I am somehow respective of the great soul, and thereby I do overlook the sun and the stars, and feel them to be but the fair accidents and effects which change and pass." So, speaking of the contemplation of Nature: "I become a transparent eyeball. I am nothing. I see all. The currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part or particle of God,"² etc.

With Plotinus and the other mystics, he teaches the doctrine of passive reception. "I desire, and look up, and put myself in the attitude of reception. I am a pensioner, not the source of this ethereal water; from some higher energy these visions come."

MYSTICISM AMONG PRIMITIVE PEOPLES.

The mysticism of primitive peoples is not the product of lofty speculation and over-refined emotions; it is the result of vivid dreams, trances, hallucinations, trancoidal states, and the like. Prospero's pessimistic remark,

"We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep"

¹ Emerson : *loc. cit.*, pp. 141-143.

² Vaughan : 2, p. 22.

is literally true of primitive man. "To primitive man," writes Dr. Brinton, "they (dreams) are real; he sees and hears in them as he does in his waking hours; he does not distinguish between the subjective creation of his brain cells and objective existence. In what they differ from daily life they are divine. They reveal the future and summon the absent."¹

The assertion of Lucretius that "the dreams of men peopled the heaven with gods," and of Tertullian that "the majority of men learn God from visions" may be untrue, but it is certain that they play a most important rôle in the religious lives of primitive and ancient peoples. A native Australian, for example, when asked if he has ever seen the great Creator, Baiame, replied: "No, not seen him, but I have felt (or inwardly perceived) him." Likewise, a Basuto chief, when asked whether his people knew of God before the missionaries came replied: "We did not know Him, but we dreamed of Him."² The Kamschatkans, we are told, gather together every morning to relate their dreams and to guess at their interpretation, and the Esquimos regulate their lives to a large extent in accordance with their dreams. The Bororos, of Brazil, take a dream so literally that a whole village will decamp and seek a distant site if one dreams of the approach of an enemy."³

So great is the belief among primitive peoples that dreams and hallucinations are divine revelations that many artificial devices such as solitude, fasting, self-hypnotization, the use of various drugs, herbs, and plants are employed to induce them during the day. "Thus it came that the whole of life, waking and sleeping, assumed a dreamy, unreal character. The traveller Spix says of the forest tribes of Brazil that they never seem fully awake; and a Pawnee war song begins by an appeal to the gods to decide if this life is aught but a dream."⁴

The ancient Mexicans and the more backward of the East Indians were certain it was. This life they taught was a dream from which death is the awakening. And the awakening which they pictured to themselves was a happy one indeed. The spirit world of the American Indians was a real Utopia. There old age, wars, hunger, disease, and other

¹ *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 65.

² *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 51.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

evils are unknown. "Every one is happy in the simple happiness which he knew on earth, hunting, feasting, and playing the old games with former friends."

Mr. James Mooney traces in a very interesting manner the parallel between the religion of the American Indians and the mystical elements in the religions of civilized peoples. "The Indian messiah religion" he tells us, "is the inspiration of a dream. Its ritual is the dance, the ecstasy, and the trance. Its priests are hypnotics and cataleptics."¹ He then shows that this is largely true of the religion of the ancient Hebrews, the Mohammedans, and to some extent of Christianity. We have but to recall the numerous dreams and trances of the patriarchs, the priests and prophets, of the cataleptic Mohammed, the visions of Jesus and especially of Paul, the second founder of Christianity, to appreciate the force of this analogy. Russia fairly teems with mystics and mystical sects of this primitive sort. The tyrannical government which exposes its subjects to the arbitrary will of the officials and nobles; the poverty, misery, fear, and uncertainty in which they live have so shattered the nervous systems of the illiterate peasants that epidemics of hysteria are of frequent occurrence, new prophets and leaders arise every day, and countless sects are born and grow with mushroom-like rapidity.²

It should now be clear that mysticism is an experience of which, on account of its many varieties, different degrees of intensity, length of duration, and resulting effects, it is difficult, if not impossible, to give a satisfactory definition. As in the case of religion we should speak of mysticisms rather than of mysticism. We shall not, however, be far wrong when we say that in all its varieties it is a kind of psychical rapture or intoxication, a theistic or pantheistic narcosis in which the subject's self-consciousness loses itself in its object or absorbs the object in itself (be that object God, flower, landscape, music, or what not), and finds the greatest enjoyment and satisfaction in its enlargement and diffusion. Consciousness overflows its banks, so to speak, and spreads infinitely becoming more and more attenuated until it finally melts, according to their testimony, into the cosmic consciousness or sentiency, the primordial psychic

¹ Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology.

² See N. Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire, passim.*

protoplasm, from which all life has evolved. These are crude figures to be sure, but in our earthly experiences matter and mind are so inseparably connected that we are constrained to explain the one in terms of the other. Our conception of it is better and more beautifully expressed by the mystic poet, Mr. Kingsley.

"And yet what bliss,
When dying in the darkness of God's light
The soul can pierce these blinding webs of nature,
And float up to the nothing, which is all things—
The ground of being, where self-forgetful silence
Is emptiness—emptiness fullness,—fullness God,—
Till we touch Him, and, like a snowflake, melt
Upon His light sphere's keen circumference."

When consciousness reaches this state the mystic is no longer able to distinguish between himself and God or the Universal Soul; all distinctions vanish. The mystic then even dares to call himself God. His condition is analogous to that of the hypnotic subject who either feels that he is being controlled by a will stronger and other than his own, that his individuality has merged into another's, or believes that another's individuality is expressed through him.

It is only when we understand this peculiar psychical state of the mystics that their many pantheistic, and from the theist's point of view, sacrilegious boasts become explicable.

Thus, for example, Angelus Silesius declares :

"God in my nature is involved,
As I in the divine;
I help to make His being up,
As much as He does mine."

"As much as I to God, owes God to me
His blissfulness and self-sufficiency."

"I am as rich as God, no grain of dust
That is not mine too,—share with me he must."

"More than His love unto Himself,
God's love to me hath been;
If more than self I too love Him,
We twain are quits, I ween."¹

Or again,

"I am as great as God, and He as small as I;
He cannot me surpass, or I beneath Him lie."

"God cannot, without me, endure a moment's space,
Were I to be destroyed, he must give up the ghost."

¹ R. A. Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics*, Vol. 2, p. 7.

"Nought seemeth high to me, I am the highest thing;
Because e'en God Himself is poor deprived of me."¹

This sounds like mere bombast and arrogant self-deification, but it was not intended as such. Silesius sang of his blissful union and identity with God, whom he literally loved to distraction, and in whom his whole being lived, and moved, and had its existence.

A few more general statements and our already too long chapter is ended.

There is a difference between mysticism and the philosophy of mysticism. The former is an experience which is felt, the latter is a system of thought or beliefs based on these experiences. Philosophical mystics, or those who have written philosophically concerning mysticism are not, therefore, necessarily real mystics. Mysticism is a psychic condition and not a creed.

Natural mysticism, such as obtains among primitive and ancient peoples, may be described as psychical confusion due either to ignorance, as when they fail to discriminate between dreaming and waking states, or to some nervous disturbance like hyperæsthesia, as when they have visions, trances, hallucinations, etc.

Religious mysticism is essentially an emotion akin to fervent love, so fervent, indeed, that it expels all the other contents of consciousness and alone rules supreme. Like the ardent youthful lover, the mystic *feels* that every fibre and atom of his being is steeped in love, and yet he is not rationally conscious of the fact or the reason why he loves so madly.² He is all emotion, the intellect when not kept in abeyance or entirely silenced is employed to analyze and describe his mystical experiences. And, just as in the world of sensations an excessive amount of light blinds, and of sound deafens, so in the emotional world an excessive amount of it volatilizes consciousness, so to speak, and throws the subject into a trance. Moreover, the mystic's love is not all of the Platonic type; most frequently it is of the sensuous sort, born of the sexual impulse and bearing every mark of it, even jealousy. Ant. Bourignon could not endure the thought that others were able to share with her "the sweet communication" of her celestial spouse,

¹ R. A. Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics*, Vol. 2, p. 22.

² See Shakespeares' Sonnets, 147-152.

and other similar cases, it will be remembered, were cited earlier in the book when we treated of the pathological relation between love and religion. We see here that "if" as Prof. Leuba says, "sex does not make religion it often gives it its particular form."¹ His suggestion that mysticism is "an experiment tried by human nature to bring the sexual life more completely under the control of the higher nervous centres and thus to make it serve for the furtherance of that to which the individual ascribes greatest worth" is interesting. Certainly it is a more aesthetic, if unnatural way of satisfying an animal impulse. The mystic yearns to live a dematerialized, supernormal life; to dwell always in the supra-liminal regions of the emotions and the intellect, and in order to do this he must, so far as he is able, die to his material self and to all material objects about him.

"While aught thou art or know'st or lov'st or hast,
Not yet, believe me, is thy burden gone.

"Who is as though he were not—ne'er had been—
That man, oh joy! is made God absolute.

"Self is surpassed by self-annihilation :
The nearer nothing, so much more divine."

This necessitates that the mystic be ego-centric, 'inward-minded,' as Leuba terms it, and anti-social. His only care is his own soul and happiness, his only desire is to revel in feeling-intoxication. For the world, his family, friends, and fellow-beings he has little or no concern. Nothing is permitted to come between him and his God. The mystic is never a reformer or missionary; he is too busy with himself to make converts. He is the very antipode of the active fanatic.

The efforts to dematerialize himself, to reduce the contents of his consciousness to one idea,—God; and his will to one desire,—union with Him, are extremely laborious and painful, and frequently bring on physical and psychical disturbances of the gravest sort. In these long drawn out struggles between the mind and body the mystic is a very Jekyll and Hyde; when the former conquers he is a saint, when the latter conquers he is a sensuous madman.

From this point of view mysticism may be described as

¹ *Mind*, Vol. 14, N. S., No. 53.

an attempt to put asunder what God hath joined together, namely, body and soul, in order that the latter might be able to communicate directly with God. With normal people, God is a *lux et vis a tergo* which brightens the path of life for them and makes their daily labor sweet. With the mystics, however, in whom the work-instinct is either undeveloped or atrophied, He is a light which forever shines in their eyes and dazzles and fatally attracts them somewhat as the flame does the moth. In spite of their strenuous ascetic exercises mystics, as a rule, belong to the passive type of men. It is stillness, solitude, death, annihilation, absorption that they yearn and strive for. Or, psychologically speaking, it is mental harmony and unity that they feel the need of, but cannot, like normal people, find them in many-sided interests, but only in one, all-absorbing occupation. They lack the will and energy to live and develop to their fullest the lives which Nature or God has given them.

Finally, mysticism generally accompanies a lowered vitality. We might almost say the two vary in inverse ratio. In this respect it is akin to sleep, trance, and the hypnotic state in which an idea, innate or suggested, is most easily realized. It thrives best in hypersensitive and neurotic soil. Many of their claims and boasts remind us forcibly of the grandiose delusions of general paretics and paranoiacs.¹

¹ For excellent psychological analyses of mysticism see Murisier : *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieux*, Paris, 1901, and Leuba : *Tendences Fondamentales des Mystiques Chrétiens*, Rev. Phil., July and Nov., 1902. Also, on the Psych. of a Group of Christian Mystics, *Mind*, Vol. 14, N. S., No. 53. A good English digest of Prof. Leuba's articles are to be found in the *Am. Jour. of Religious Psy. and Ed.*, Vol. 1, pp. 87-89.

CHAPTER IV.

SYMBOLISM, FETICHISM, AND INTERPRETATION.

SYMBOLISM.

Closely akin to mysticism is symbolism, which may be defined as the attempt to give to spirituality a sensuous and perceptible body ; or, to express mind in terms of matter, infinity in terms of finity, the abstract in terms of the concrete, the general in terms of the particular. “ In the symbol proper,” writes Carlyle, “ what we call a symbol there is ever more or less distinctly and directly some embodiment and revelation of the Infinite ; the Infinite is made to blend itself with the Finite, to stand visible, and, as it were, attainable there.”¹

Symbolism is a natural, and, therefore, a necessary and useful psychical activity ; without it religion could not, perhaps, have been born ; certainly it could not have thrived ; and art, language, literature, philosophy, and even science could not have developed, for all these are built up more or less of symbols. The naïve and animistic mind of primitive man found it difficult to think in general terms, and abstraction was completely beyond its power. Attributes and qualities, such as color, taste, odor, cold, warmth, hardness, goodness, etc., were never separated from their objects. Thought was always of concrete things. And even now, Infinity, Eternity, Immortality, God, the Absolute, and other such abstract conceptions are, as purely such, meaningless for most of us. They are the unknown xs and ys, whose values we determine, as far as possible, by means of other xs and ys whose values we already know. We measure Infinity by yards, Eternity by years, and God by man. That is to say, our thoughts, imaginations, memories, ideas, and the like are all derived and developed from our multifarious sensations and perceptions,—our life experiences ; and

¹ *Sartor Resartus.*

therefore, in a sense, more true than poetic, we create or re-create God and the Universe in our own images. In the whole hierarchy of divine attributes there is not a single one which is not human or an exaggeration of a human one. To quote the famous line of Locke, "Nihil est in intellectu quod non antea fuerit in sensu." The "Nisi intellectus ipse" of Leibnitz is here impertinent. This truth is nowhere more strikingly manifest than in the evolution of language and its influence on the evolution of thought. Words among primitive peoples express action; they are endowed with life like living beings, and transmit their vitality to the objects to which they become attached. Everything has sex, for example, because their words have gender. M. André Lefèvre, in his scholarly work *La Religion*, maintains the thesis that all the supernatural agents and metaphysical beings of all peoples owe their life, their activity, and their sway over the thought and conduct of individuals and groups "to the metaphoric power inherent in the most rudimentary language." He tells us that the same god in different groups or even in the same region will, "according to the times or the caprices of language behold himself a male under one name and a female under another; and, invested with beauty or ugliness, benevolence or malignity, in the flower of youth or decline of age he must act conformably to the habits and proprieties of his sex."¹

Whether or not this statement be true, whether words precede thoughts or thoughts words, it is certainly true that the carriers of our thoughts, in the act of transmission, leave indelible impressions of their symbolic nature on their burdens. Spirit takes on form and body, and mind becomes matter through language, just as matter mysteriously becomes mind through the senses.

Even philosophy, the clearing-house of all intellectual commerce, deals only in appearances or symbols, drawing now and then in its mystical hours upon the transcendent treasury for reality. Our thoughts, our lives, our universes are founded upon symbols. This is the burden of all philosophies worthy of the name.

Now, just as bits of paper bearing the government stamp are regarded by the masses as money, so are symbols bearing the divine stamp regarded by them as divine, and not

infrequently as divinities themselves. Witness the idols, fetiches, amulets, and charms of primitive peoples, the cross, crescent, pillar, wheel, and innumerable other symbols of more civilized peoples the world over.

But man must be sure that he is not deceived, that somewhere in the realm of space the reality actually exists. The Jews in the Wilderness insisted on seeing God or some unmistakable manifestation of his power, and centuries later the same God had to incarnate Himself and live and move among his human creatures as one of them. The time is perhaps ripe for a second incarnation, at any rate, millions are living in the hope that it will soon take place.

In religious symbolism as such, there is nothing abnormal any more than there is in secular symbolism ; in treasuring bits of paper, for example, tattered flags, heirlooms, autographs, pieces of apparel of famous men and women, etc. These are the things which bring us as near as possible to reality ; to the persons to whom they once belonged, they are the links which bind us to them and make us in so far, at least, related. "To possess a glove once worn by Shakespeare," writes d'Alviella, "a bit of his manuscript, his autograph, is to possess a treasure which not even the greatest among us would not prize."¹

Symbols are powerful aids to faith because by means of the many sensations they give rise to they keep the object or being symbolized, constantly in the foreground of consciousness. But just so soon as the being or idea, which was once represented in the symbol is forgotten, as soon as the soul within the body is neglected, there is spiritual degeneration and death. The symbol which was at first used merely to assist the mind to conceive of the Deity then becomes a fetich as important as the Deity itself and soon displaces it altogether. Bits of the cross on which Jesus was believed to have died were, during the Middle Ages and even later, considered sacred, and regarded as the best remedy for all diseases. Next in favor came the tears of the Saviour, then of the Virgin Mary and St. Peter, then the drops of blood of Jesus and the Martyrs. Hair and toe nails also had great remedial qualities and were sold at extravagant prices. A lucrative trade was carried on in iron filings from the chains with which it was claimed that Peter

¹ See Goblet D'Alviella : 'The Migration of Symbols.' p. 3.

and Paul had been bound. These filings were regarded by Pope Gregory I as efficacious in healing as were the bones of the martyrs.

How and by whom these relics were collected and preserved no one thought, no one dared, perhaps, to ask. To doubt was already heresy. Mr. Mackay, in his *Popular Delusions* half humorously remarks, "There were toe nails enough in Europe at the time of the Council of Cleremont to have filled a sack, all of which were devoutly believed to have grown on the sacred foot of St. Peter." Concerning the fragments of the true cross he says, "they would, if collected together in one place, have been almost sufficient to have built a Cathedral."¹ Poor indeed was the church in those days which did not possess some of these relics.

Touching the hangings about the tomb of St. Martin was sufficient to cure Bishop Gregory of Tours of a pain in the temples. He repeated the experiment three times with equal success. Once he was cured of an attack of mortal dysentery by drinking a glass of water in which he had dissolved a pinch of dust scraped up on the tomb of the Saint. At another time when his tongue had become swollen and tumefied, he licked the railing of the tomb of St. Martin and his tongue returned to its natural size. Even a toothache was cured by St. Martin's relics. In the following apostrophe of Bishop Gregory to the relics of St. Martin we have a very good example of symbolism degenerated into fetich worship. "Oh ineffable theriac! ineffable pigment! admirable antidote! celestial purge! superior to all drugs of the faculty! sweeter than aromatics! stronger than unguents together! thou cleanest the stomach like scammony, the lungs like hyssop, thou purgest the head like pyre-thrig!"

Very important among these relics was the Agnus Dei, or piece of wax from the Paschal candles, stamped with the figures of a lamb and consecrated by the Pope. In 1471 Pope Paul II expatiated to the Church on the efficacy of this fetich in preserving men from fire, shipwreck, tempest, lightning, and hail, as well as assisting women in childbirth; and he reserved to himself and his successors the manufacture of it. Even as late as 1517 Pope Leo X issued, for a consideration, tickets bearing a cross and the following inscription: "This cross measured forty times makes the

¹ Vol. 1, p. 157.

height of Christ in his humanity. He who kisses it is preserved for seven days from falling sickness, apoplexy, and sudden death."

"Water in which a single hair of a Saint had been dipped was used as a purgative; water in which St. Remy's hair had been dipped cured fevers; wine in which the bones of a Saint had been dipped cured lunacy; oil from a lamp burning before the tomb of St. Gall cured tumors; St. Valentine cured epilepsy; St. Christopher, throat diseases; St. Utropius, dropsy; St. Ovid, deafness; St. Vitus, St. Anthony, and a multitude of other saints, the maladies which bear their names. Even as late as 1784 we find certain authorities in Bavaria ordering that any one bitten by a mad dog shall at once put up prayers at the shrine of St. Hubert, and not waste his time in any attempts at medical or surgical cure. In the twelfth century we find a noted cure attempted by causing the invalid to drink water in which St. Bernard had washed his hands. Flowers which rested on the tomb of a saint, when steeped in water, were supposed to be especially efficacious in various diseases," etc., etc.¹ Similar beliefs and practices obtain to-day among the lower class French who visit the shrine at Lourdes, the Canadians who journey to the shrine of St. Anne d'Aupres, and among millions of Russian peasants.

In all these cases we have symbolism degenerated into fetichism and idolatry of the crassest sort. It is a distinct backsliding from a height already attained, and is pathological in that it has proven injurious to the health of the believers and detrimental to the natural development of science. "Naturally, the belief thus sanctioned by the successive heads of the Church, infallible in all teachings regarding faith and morals," writes Mr. A. D. White, "created a demand for amulets and charms of all kinds; and under this influence we find a reversion to old pagan fetiches. Nothing on the whole stood more constantly in the way of any proper development of medical science than these fetich cures whose efficacy was based on theological reasoning and sanctioned by ecclesiastical policy."²

Fetichism, like symbolism, is normal in its proper time

¹ See A. D. White: *Hist. of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, Vol. 2, pp. 28 ff.

² A. D. White: *Hist. of the Warfare of Science with Theol.*, Vol. 2, p. 30.

and place. There is not a plant, animal, or object on our earth; not a star or planet in the heavens; not a fish, perhaps, in the sea, that has not at some time been the object of religious worship, and believed to possess talismanic powers. And all this was and is natural and necessary to primitive peoples as it is to our own children; it harmonizes with their stage of development. But not so with the Christians of the Middle Ages and later, not so with modern Buddhism and Brahmanism, not so with the Russian army from the commander-in-chief down to the ordinary, who have taken with them icons of their favorite saints to protect them in their battles against the heathen Japanese,¹ not so with the French and Canadians of to-day. In the one case fetichism is a natural religion, the only one possible to that stage of development; in the other it is superstition and inexcusable ignorance, a degeneration and disgrace to the religion to which it parasitically adheres.

The Christianity of the Middle Ages, for example, seems to have entirely forgotten John's definition of religion and even the Sermon on the Mount in which the Master laid bare the living heart of religion. And indeed this is true of the Christianity of a comparatively late period, in which ceremony played the leading, and morality only a minor rôle. Mr. R. P. Knight, speaking of the early part of the 17th century, says, "In religious matters, while open impurity of life incurred little disapproval, there existed an extraordinary sensitiveness in regard to every possible encroachment upon the domain fenced off and consecrated to technical orthodoxy. There was a taboo as strict if not as mysterious as was ever imposed and enforced by the Sacerdotal caste of the Kanaka Islands."² To disregard the smallest religious ordinance was considered a criminal act and punished as such. The rule of St. Columbanus, for instance, required, among other things, "a year's penance for him who loses a consecrated wafer; six months for him who suffers it to be eaten by mice; twenty days for him who lets it turn red; forty days for him who contemptuously flings it into the water; twenty days for him who brings it up through weakness of stomach, but if through illness, ten days. He who neglects his Amen to the Benedicite,

¹ See Open Court, Sept., 1904.² Symbolical Lang. of Ancient Art and Mythology, Preface, p. iv. .

who speaks when eating, who forgets to make the sign of the Cross on his spoon, or on a lantern lighted by a younger brother is to receive six or twelve stripes.”¹

Similarly, among the Hindus, any mistake made in the food that might be eaten, in the dress that might be worn, in the sacrifice that might be paid; any error in pronunciation, a mistake about clarified butter, an unauthorized arrangement of raiment or hair might involve the worshipper in pains and penalties of the most awful character.

“The seventeenth Fargard or chapter of the Vendidad—a portion of the Zendavesta, is tediously liturgical and discusses such minutiae as the arrangement of the hair of the head, the extraction of bad or gray hairs, and the cutting of nails. If these operations are performed without certain prescribed ceremonies, the devs or demons come upon earth, and parasitical organisms are produced to the great discomfort and injury of man. Little wonder, then, that the common people employed the priests at the price practically of their freedom, to assist them in their worship.”²

The religion of the Buddhists of Thibet requires that the believer should be all his time immersed in holy contemplation of the perfections of Buddha, and the believer is taught that it is a meritorious act and a patent cure for sin to be continually reading or reciting portions of the sacred books of Buddha. But, as many of the people could not read, and still more had not the time to carry out these injunctions, a contrivance had to be invented whereby they could serve their God and attend to their work at the same time. The priests declared that it would be sufficient for those who could not read, if they merely turned over the rolled manuscripts which embodied the invaluable precepts. But this, too, required a vast amount of time and trouble, and therefore a further simplification had to be made. Praising wheels or cylinders, varying in size from a few inches to many feet in height and diameter were constructed so that they could be easily rotated by hand or by water. These cylinders are filled with paper or cloth, on which is repeated as many times as can be written a Mantra, *i. e.*, a word or combination of words which may be used by way of invocation during an act of worship. Each time the cylinder re-

¹ Quoted by Herbert Spencer: Ecclesiastical Institutions.

² W. H. D. Adams: Curiosities of Superstition.

volves on its axis the devotee is accredited with having uttered the pious invocation written on the strips of paper or cloth, and receives so much Kharma or merit. Since, therefore, the more the wheel is turned, the more Kharma is acquired by the person who caused it to turn, the easiest and best thing to do is to construct cylinders which can be turned by hand or better still by water.

“On the outside of many a temple” (in Thibet), writes Mr. Wm. Simpson,¹ “there was a long row of small cylinders, each about the size of an oyster barrel, placed in the wall at such a height that any one in passing could turn them with the hand.” He also describes several wheels turned by water power. A cheaper variation of the same machine was a small cylinder which could be tied around the wrist, and would continue to grind out acts of worship while the owner carried on his daily work. Mr. Adams compares these turnings to the telling of beads done so frequently in European lands, not only by nuns and monks, but even by the workmen ‘as homeward along the road they plod their weary way,’ and says: “Prayer, even among Christians, is apt to degenerate into a dull, mechanical uniformity, and to become scarcely less perfunctory than that which the Thibetans grind out of their prayer-machine.”²

Note, for example, the repetitions in the following:

Heart of Mary, full of grace, pray for us!
“ “ “ , sanctuary of the Holy Trinity, pray for us !
“ “ “ , tabernacle of the Incarnate Word, “ “ “ !
“ “ “ , illustrious throne of glory, “ “ “ ! etc.

Also the oft-recurring “Good Lord deliver us!” and “We beseech Thee to hear us, Good Lord.”

The orthodox Jews repeat on the Day of Atonement and New Year the following phrase, with slight additions and variations, 168 times: “For the sin that we have committed in thy presence,” etc. And on week days they repeat the following 44 and 26 times respectively:

“Our Father, our King,” etc.
“For His mercy endureth forever,” etc.

Besides these there are numerous other prayers which consist of long and tedious repetitions of the same phrase.

“There is a coarse superstition embodied in the praying

¹ The Buddhist Praying Wheel.

² W. H. D. Adams: *Curiosities of Superstition*, p. 2.

machine," writes Dr. Conway, "which all sects share alike: one which is inherent in the very nature of prayer. It is the belief implied that the benefits of this universe are to be secured by the perfunctory lip-service or barrel-service of human beings."¹

Whatever the origin of this invocation by hand and water power may have been (there are several different theories) it is certainly the most curious and grotesque rite in the whole history of religion and superstition, and shows us to what extent degeneration, if unchecked, will proceed.

Another group of symbolic rites which seems to have been well-nigh universal, and to have not infrequently degenerated into mere fetiches are the various water and fire baptismal rites. In the Protestant church, baptism has been the cause of a wide schism and of interminable discussions as to whether it should be administered to infants or only adults, and whether it should be performed by dipping, sprinkling, or immersion of the whole body, according to the different interpretations of the Greek verb 'bapto.' A perfectly normal rite so long as its symbolic meaning is not forgotten, it becomes a pathological fetich when the subjects are taken out in midwinter and immersed in ice-cold water, as is so frequently done in Russia, and even in some parts of our own country.

Purification by jumping through the flame of a sacred fire is still in vogue among the Hindus, as it was among the earliest Romans and also among the native Irish. Men, women, children, and even cattle in Ireland leap over or pass through sacred bonfires annually kindled in honor of Baal (an ancient title of the sun). Interesting in this connection are the numerous obscene phallic rites and symbols,² and the still more foul and revolting scatological rites of primitive peoples.³ But we need not enter into the disgusting details.

"Ritual worship in general," says Prof. James, "appears to the modern transcendentalist, as well as to the ultra-puritanic type of mind, as if addressed to a deity of an almost absurdly childish character, taking delight in toy-shop furniture, tapers and tinsel, costume and mumbling and mummering, and finding his 'glory' incomprehensibly enhanced

¹ M. D. Conway: *Idols and Ideals*, p. 68.

² R. P. Knight: *The Worship of Priapus*.

³ J. G. Bourke: *Scatological Rites of All Nations*.

thereby ;—just as on the other hand the formless spaciousness of pantheism appears quite empty to ritualistic natures, and the gaunt theism of evangelical sects seems intolerably bald and chalky and bleak.”¹

It is pathological symbolism that Carlyle alludes to when he says : “ Meanwhile in our era of the world, these same Church-Clothes have gone sorrowfully out-at-elbows ; nay, far worse, many of them have become mere hollow Shapes, or Masks, under which no living Figure or Spirit any longer dwells ; but only spiders and unclean beetles in horrid accumulation drive their trade, and the mask still glares on you with its glass eyes, in ghastly affectation of Life—some generation-and-half after Religion has quite withdrawn from it, and in unnoticed nooks is weaving for herself new Vestures wherewith to reappear and bless us, or our sons or grandsons.”²

Religion to be normal must, as has so often been said before, be alive and keep abreast of the developments in other fields. If the sheath which covers and protects religion in its infancy is allowed to harden, then either the life is slowly crushed out, or, if internal growth continues, the outer shell is broken and cast off, causing much unnecessary pain to the religious organism. The figure which Prof. LeConte uses in speaking of the social organism applies with equal force to the religious organism. The religious organism should be “ constructed on the vertebrate instead of the crustacean plan ; with the skeleton within in eternal ethical principles, instead of without, in dogmas and formulas ; and the exterior with its customs, habits, forms of belief, etc., should be left plastic and yielding to interior growth, sensitive to all external influences, and receptive of all new knowledge.”³

That the religious organism is still in many places constructed on the crustacean plan is evident from the fact that one may lead a most Christ-like life and not be considered a Christian by the various denominations because he has not been baptized, or has not received the Sacrament, or performed some other religious ceremony. The venerable Tolstoi has recently been excommunicated and anathematized by the Russian Orthodox Church, his greatest sin being, according to the Synod, “ reviling the most sacred objects

¹ *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 330.

² *Sartor Resartus*: Bk. 3, ch. 2.

³ *Religious Significance of Science*, *Monist*, Jan., 1900.

of the faith of the Orthodox people, he has not shrunk from subjecting to derision the greatest of Sacraments, the Holy Eucharist.”¹ The Russian Church, as is well known, has always laid greatest emphasis on the form, the ceremonies and rites, and but very little on the spirit. She has never striven to awaken the true religious sentiment in her adherents or to satisfy their moral and aesthetic needs. She has always busied herself with forms, demanded ritual punctiliousness, blind worship of the icons or sacred images, monotonous repetition of certain passages of prayers, frequent fastings, genuflexions, etc. To the masses religion means the performance of ceremonies and interminable discussions of such questions as, How should the fingers be placed in making the sign of the Cross? What is the proper orthography of Jesus,—Issous or Iissous? Should the word hallelujah be repeated three times or twice? And countless other such unimportant and absurd problems. Difference of opinion with regard to these points has given rise to numerous sects and untiring persecution on the part of the mother Church.

Among the orthodox Jews to-day, their reform brothers who worship bare-headed and in English or German or French rather than Hebrew which they do not understand, who have discarded the robe and phylacteries and have discontinued the performance of many useless ceremonies, the meaning of which few know, are regarded as churls and treated with contempt. For the orthodox Jews the law concerning fringes is still considered the most important of all the six hundred and thirteen precepts.

Unfortunately, a large part of the religious world does not yet understand the true meaning of religion as did Paul when he said: “For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision which *is* outward in the flesh:

“But he *is* a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and not* in the letter; whose praise *is not* of men, but of God.”

At the other extreme to this we have sects like the Quakers, the Nemoliaki, or those who do not pray, the Chalapouts, and other Russian sects belonging to the Rational Current who have renounced all forms and ceremonies.

¹ Tolstoy: *Essays and Letters*, p. 262.

Such religions, whatever may be said in their favor, are certainly lacking in those elements which the æsthetic nature of man needs for its satisfaction. They are cold, barren, colorless, and imperfect. The best religion, of course, is that which satisfies all sides of a man's nature in such a way that a healthy harmony and balance is maintained among them.

INTERPRETATION AND BIBLIOLATRY.

At the time when Paul spoke the above sentences, the Jewish religion,—that loftiest product of the ancient mind—had already degenerated into legalism, formalism, and bibliolatry. Not that it had been neglected and allowed to fall into desuetude, but rather because it had been over-stimulated. The Jewish consciousness suffered not from atrophy of the religious sense, but from hypertrophy. For centuries upon centuries the Jewish mind allowed itself but one task, the study of the Law. All other subjects were considered of little significance and importance when compared with the subject-matter of the great Book of which Jehovah himself was the Author. This was the mental pabulum of all the *Sopherim* (458-320 B. C.), *Chachamim* (B. C. 320-A. D. 13) *Tanaim* (13-190 A. D.), *Amoraim* (190-498), *Seboraim* (498-689), and the *Goanim* (689-900). “The study of the law,” the Talmud tells us, “is of even greater merit than to rescue one from accidental death, than building the Temple, and greater than honoring father or mother.” Let the reader picture to himself a great people concentrating all their intellectual energies upon a single book for more than twenty-two centuries and he will be able, in a measure, to imagine the mass of subtleties, vagaries, fancies, and hairsplittings they must have created. “All Gentile learning was forbidden; no communion was allowed with the human intellect outside the Pharisaic pale,” and the result was, naturally enough, an inverted pyramid. As with the Chinese, classicism, narrow and over-specialization, exclusiveness, and crystallization spelt their doom.

Upon the Bible, which we may consider the foundation of the pyramid, were laid first the Mishna, which is a minute explanation of and commentary on the Bible, containing 6 orders (Sedarim), 71 Massictoth, 633 Perakim, and 4187 Mishnaioth. Then upon the Mishna were laid the two *Geamaras*, which follow the Mishna word by word, sentence by

sentence, commenting upon it and deciding when possible debatable questions. Later, Rashi added his voluminous commentary on the Bible and the Gemara; and last of all there is the Quabala, which explains symbolically every verse, word, letter, the shape of the letters, their position in the words, every vowel point and accent of the whole Massorah. Reb Aquiba went still farther and maintained that there was a mystic meaning in every horn and letter-flourish of every letter, "just as in every fibre of an ant's foot or a gnat's wing."¹

A few extracts of these works, which, as already said, represent the labors of the Jewish mind for many centuries, will give the reader at least a faint idea of their contents and character.²

The following are the opening and closing paragraphs of the Talmud, which is composed of the Mishna and the Gemara.

"From what time is the Shemah³ read in the evening? From the time when the priests enter the sanctuary to eat of their heave-offerings, until the end of the first night-watch. These are the words of Rabbi Eliezar, but the sages say until midnight, and Rabdon Gamliel says until the dawn of morning. It came to pass that the son of this Rabbi once returned from a banqueting-house after midnight, and said unto him, 'We have not yet read the Shemah!' He said unto them, 'If the morning dawn has not yet appeared, ye are bound to read it; and not in this case only, but in every instance where the sages say *until midnight*.'

Their precept holds good until the morning daybreak.

The precept with regard to the burning of the fat and the joints holds good till the dawn of morning. For all offerings which must be eaten the same day, the precept holds good till the morning dawn rises. If this be the case, why do the sages say 'until midnight?' In order to keep man far from transgression.—The Mishna on Blessings.

"The Tanna (author of the Mishna), it is asked, to what

¹ See Farrar: *Hist. of Interpretation*, p. 74.

² These selections are taken from the following works: Paul L. Hermon: *A Talmudic Miscellany*; H. Polano: *Selections from the Talmud*; Jos. Barclay: *The Talmud*; Rev. M. C. Peters: *Wit and Wisdom of the Talmud*; and F. W. Farrar: *History of Interpretation*.

³ The prayer beginning "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."

does he refer when he teaches 'from what time?' And besides, why does he teach about it in the evening first, instead of in the morning first? The Tanna rests upon Scripture, where it is written (Deut. 6), 'When thou liest down and when thou risest up,' and thus he teaches the time of reading the Shemah when thou liest down. When does it begin? It begins from the hour when the priests enter to eat their heave-offering. But if thou wishest, I will say that he derives it from the account of the creation of the world, where it is written (Gen. 1), 'And the evening and the morning were day one.' If this be so, why does a later Mishna (fol. 2, col. 1) teach that at dawn two benedictions are to be said before the Shemah, and one after it, and at eventide two benedictions are to be repeated before it, and two after it? Ought it not to teach concerning the evening first? The Tanna commences (in the above Mishna) 'in the evening,' then (in the later Mishna) he teaches 'at the dawn.' When he treats of the dawn he explains the particulars relating to the dawn, and then explains the particulars relating to the evening.

"Mar (the master, or editor of the Mishna) says, 'from the hour when the priests enter to partake of the heave-offering.' And from what time do the priests enter to partake of the heave-offering? Reply: From the time that the stars appear.' He should have taught them 'from the time that the stars appear' (which would have been easier to be understood). This he makes us to apprehend by the way. From what point of time do the priests eat the heave-offering? From the appearing of the stars. And then he gives us to understand that the expiatory sacrifice does not hinder (the priests eating of the heave-offering), according to the teaching of tradition (Lev. 22), 'And when the sun goes down he shall be clean.' It is the going down of the sun which might hinder him eating of the heave-offering, but the expiatory sacrifice does not hinder him eating it. But whence (do we know), that this 'when the sun is down' means 'when the sun sets,' and 'he shall be clean' is 'the purity of the day?' Perhaps."

This is the first page of the Talmud. 'Perhaps' is the catchword of the next page.

"Tallow or suet of clean cattle ('clean' is the catchword which finishes one page and commences the next) does not defile like carrion, and requires legal authorization. Tallow

or suet of unclean cattle defiles like carrion, and therefore needs no legal authorization. Unclean fish and locusts in villages require discrimination."

"A beehive, says Rabbi Eleazar, is like landed property, and a title-deed is to be written to give right of possession. In its standing place it is not liable to become defiled, and he who takes of its honey on the Sabbath is in duty bound to bring a sin-offering. But the sages say it is not like landed property; no title-deed is to be drawn up in regard to it; it is liable to defilement (as it stands) in its place, and he who takes honey from it is not guilty. From what time does honeycomb become liable to ceremonial defilement as food? The school of Shammai says from the time the beehive is fumigated; the school of Hillel says, from the time the beehive is emptied."

"Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi says, the Holy one—blessed be He!—will in the future give to every righteous man an inheritance of three hundred and ten worlds, for it is said (Prov. 8), 'That I may cause those that love me to inherit substance, (בָּרוּךְ, by gematria = 310) and I will fill their treasures.' Rabbi Shimon ben Chalapta says, the Holy One—blessed be He! has found no such vehicle for blessing Israel as peace, for it is said (Prov. 29), 'The Lord will give strength unto His people. The Lord will bless His people with peace.'"

Thus ends the Talmud, which is so encyclopedic in character and so huge in its dimensions that, according to the Rabbis, it would require one seven years, studying six hours a day, to attain even a moderate acquaintance with its contents.

Mr. Hershon has grouped about 1,600 quotations from the Talmud according "to the prominence in them of particular numbers, on which special stress is laid." The following are a few of them:

ONE.

"Where do we learn that the Shechinah rests even upon *one* who studies the law? In Exodus 20: 24, where it is written, 'In all places where I record my name I will come unto *thee*, and I will bless *thee*! . . . One pang of remorse at a man's heart is of more avail than many stripes applied to him. (See Prov. 17: 10.) . . .

'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is *one* Lord!' (Deut. 6: 4). Whosoever prolongs the utterance of the word

(אֶחָד) *one*, shall have his days and years prolonged to him. (A story is told that Rabbi Akiba, when his flesh was being torn with currycombs sounded forth the word (אֶחָד) *one*, until his soul departed from him. Then came forth a Bath Kol, or echo of the voice of God, from heaven which said, 'Blessed art thou, Rabbi Akiba, for thy soul and the word *one* left thy body together.' . . . Once a Gentile came to Shamai and said, 'Proselytize me, but on condition that thou teach me the whole law, in the whole of it, whilst I stand upon one leg.' Shamai drove him off with the builder's rod which he held in his hand. When he came to Hillel with the same challenge, Hillel converted him by answering him on the spot, 'That which is hateful to thyself, do not do to thy neighbor. This is the whole law, and the rest is its commentary.' . . .

Not *one* single thing has God created in vain. He created the snail as a remedy for a blister; the fly for the sting of a wasp; the gnat for the bite of a serpent; the serpent itself for healing the itch or (the scab); and the lizard (or the spider) for the sting of a scorpion. . . . When a man is dangerously ill, the law grants dispensation, for it says, 'You may break *one* Sabbath on his behalf, that he may be preserved to keep many Sabbaths.' . . .

Rabbi Meyer saith, 'Great is repentance, because for the sake of *one* that truly repenteth the whole world is pardoned; as it is written (Hosea 14:4), 'I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely, for mine anger is turned away from him.' It is not said 'from them,' but 'from him.' . . .

He who observes *one* precept, in addition to those which, as originally laid upon him, he has discharged, shall receive favor from above, and is equal to him who has fulfilled the whole law. . . .

One wins eternal life after a struggle of years another finds it in *one* hour. . . .

The greatness of God is infinite; for while with *one* die man impresses many coins and all are exactly alike, the King of kings, the Holy One—blessed be He!—with *one* die impresses the same image (of Adam) on all men, and yet not one of them is like his neighbor. So that every one ought to say, 'For myself is the world created.'

'He caused the lame to mount on the back of the blind, and judged them both as *one*.' Antonius said to the Rabbi, 'Body and soul might each plead right of acquittal at the

day of judgment.' 'How so?' he asked. 'The body might plead that it was the soul that had sinned, and urge saying, 'See, since the departure of the soul I have lain in the grave as still as a stone.' And the soul might plead, 'It was the body that sinned, for since the day I left it, I have flitted about in the air as innocent as a bird.' To which the Rabbi replied and said 'Whereunto this thing is like, I will tell thee in a parable. It is like unto a king who had an orchard with some fine young fig trees planted in it. He set two gardeners to take care of them, of whom one was lame and the other blind. One day the lame one said to the blind, 'I see some fine figs in the garden; come take me on thy shoulders and we will pluck them and eat them.' By and by the lord of the garden came, and missing the fruit from the fig trees, began to make inquiry after them. The lame one, to excuse himself, plead, 'I have no legs to walk with;' and the blind one, to excuse himself, plead, 'I have no eyes to see with.' What did the lord of the garden do? He caused the lame to mount upon the back of the blind, and judged them both as *one*. So likewise will God reunite soul and body, and judge them both as *one* together; as it is written (Ps. 50:4), 'He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that He may judge His people.' 'He shall call to the heavens from above,' that alludes to the soul, 'and to the earth, that He may judge His people,' that refers to the body. . . .

One thing obtained with difficulty is far better than a hundred things procured with ease. . . .

It is written (Gen. 28:2), 'And he took from the *stones* of the place;' and again it is written (ver. 18), 'And he took the *stone*.' Rabbi Isaac says this teaches that all these stones gathered themselves together into one place, as if each were eager that the saint should lay his head upon it. It happened, as the Rabbis tell us, that all the stones were swallowed up by one another, and thus merged into *one* stone. . . . Rabbi Yehudah tells us that Rav says, a man should never absent himself from the lecture hall, not even for *one* hour; for the above Mishnah had been taught at college for many years, but the reason of it had never been made plain till the *hour* when Rabbi Chanina ben Akavia came and explained it. (The Mishnah alluded to is short and simple, viz., Where is it taught that a ship is clean to the touch? From Prov. 30:19, 'The way of a ship in

the midst of the sea' (*i. e.*, as the sea is clean to the touch, therefore a ship must also be clean to the touch). . . .

'Like the hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces' (Jer. 28: 29). As a hammer divideth fire into many sparks, so *one* verse of Scripture has many meanings and many explanations.

"And the frog (sing. no.) came up (also sing.) and covered the land of Egypt." (Exod. 8: 1). "There was but *one* frog," said Rabbi Elazar, "And she so multiplied as to fill the whole land of Egypt." "Yes, indeed," said Rabbi Akiva, "there was, as you say, but *one* frog, but she herself was so large as to fill all the land of Egypt." Whereupon Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah said unto him, "Akiva, what business hast thou with Haggadah? Be off with thy legends, and get thee to the laws thou art familiar with about plagues and tents. Though thou sayest right in this matter, for there was only *one* frog, but she croaked so loud that the frogs came from everywhere else to her croaking."

Rabbi Levi contends that Manasseh has no portion in the world to come while Rabbi Yehudah maintains that he has; and each supports his conclusion in contradiction of the other, from *one* and the same Scripture text. . . .

He who observes but *one* precept secures for himself an advocate, and he who commits *one* single sin procures for himself an accuser. . . . He who learns from another *one* chapter, *one* halachah, *one* verse, or *one* word, or even a *single letter*, is bound to respect him. . . . "Repent *one* day before thy death." In relation to which Rabbi Eliezer was asked by his disciples, "How is a man to repent *one* day before his death, since he does not know on what day he shall die?" "So much more the reason is there," he replied, "that he should repent to-day, lest he die the day after: and thus will all his days be penitential ones." A priest who is blind in *one* eye should not be judge of the plague; for it is said (Lev. 13:12), "Wheresoever the priest (with both eyes) looketh."

Two.

Rabbi Ami says, "Knowledge is of great price, for it is placed between *two* divine names, as it is written (1 Sam. 2: 3), "A God of knowledge is the Lord," and therefore mercy is to be denied to him who has no knowledge; for it

is written (Isa. 27:11), “It is a people of no understanding, therefore He that hath made them will not have mercy on them.” . . .

When the Holy One—blessed be He!—remembers that His children are in trouble amongst the nations of the world, He drops *two* tears into the great ocean, the noise of which startles the world from one end to the other, and causes the earth to quake. . . .

If speech is worth one sela (a small coin so called), silence is worth *two*. . . .

Given *two* dry firebrands and one piece of green wood, the dry will set fire to the green. . . .

With *two* dogs they caught the lion. . . .

Where are we told that when *two* sit together and study the law the Shechinah is with them? In Mal. 3:16, where it is written, “They that feared the Lord spake often *one* to *another*, and the Lord hearkened and heard it.”

The Rabbis teach concerning the *two* kidneys in man, that one counsels him to do good and the other to do evil; and it appears that the former is situated on the right side and the latter on the left. Hence it is written (Eccl. 10:2), “A wise man’s heart is at his right hand, but a fool’s heart is at his left.”

Adam had *two* faces; for it is said (Ps. 139:5), “Thou hast made me behind and before.” . . .

“If Mordecai, before whom thou hast begun to fall, be of the seed of the Jews, expect not to prevail against him, but falling, thou shalt fall.” (Esth. 6:13.) Wherefore these *two* fallings? They told Haman, saying, “This nation is likened to the dust, and is also likened to the stars, when they are down, they are down even to the dust, but when they begin to rise, they rise even to the stars.” . . .

On the day when Isaac was weaned, Abraham made a great feast, to which he invited all the people of the land. Not all who came to enjoy the feast believed in the alleged occasion of its celebration, for some said contemptuously, “This old couple have adopted a foundling, and provided a feast to persuade us that the child is their own offspring.” What did Abraham do? He invited all the great men of the day, and Sarah invited their wives, who brought their infants, but not their nurses along with them. On this occasion Sarah’s breast became like *two* fountains, for she supplied, of her own body, nourishment to all the children.

Still some were unconvinced, and said, "Shall a child be born to one that is a hundred years old, and shall Sarah, who is ninety years old, bear?" (Gen. 17:17.) Whereupon, to silence this objection, Isaac's face was changed, so that it became the very picture of Abraham's; then one and all exclaimed, "Abraham begat Isaac." . . .

"And I will make thy windows of agates" (Isa. 54:12). Two of the angels in Heaven, Gabriel and Michael, once disputed about this: one maintained that the stone should be an onyx, and the other asserted it should be a jasper; but the Holy One—blessed be He!—said unto them, "Let it be as both say, **כֶּדֶב וּכֶדֶן**," which, abbreviated, is **כֶּדֶב** (*i. e.*, an agate). . . .

For *two* to sit together and have no discourse about the law, is to sit in the seat of the scornful. . . .

It is thus that Rav Joseph taught what is meant when it is written in Isaiah 12:1, "I will praise Thee, O Lord, because Thou wast angry with me: Thine anger will depart and Thou wilt comfort me." "The text applies," he says, "to *two* men who were going abroad on a mercantile enterprise, one of whom, having had a thorn run into his foot, had to forego his intended journey, and began in consequence to utter reproaches and blaspheme. Having afterwards learned that the ship in which his companions had sailed had sunk to the bottom of the sea, he confessed his short-sightedness and praised God for his mercy."

THREE.

The night is divided into *three* watches, and at each watch the Holy One—blessed be He!—sits and roars like a lion; as it is written (Jer. 25:30), "The Lord will roar from on high. . . . roaring, He will roar over his habitation." The marks by which the division of the night is recognized are these: In the *first* watch the ass brays; in the *second* the dog barks; and in the *third* the babe is at the breast and the wife converses with her husband. . . .

Rav Yehudah used to say, "Three things shorten a man's days, and years: 1. Neglecting to read the law when it is given to him for that purpose; seeing it is written (Deut. 30:20), 'For He (who gave it) is thy life and the length of thy days.' 2. Omitting to repeat the customary benediction over a cup of blessing; for it is written (Gen. 12:3),

‘And I will bless them that bless thee.’ 3. And the assumption of a Rabbinical air: for Rabbi Chama bar Chanena says, ‘Joseph died before any of his brethren, because he domineered over them.’ . . .

Three dreams come to pass: That which is dreamed in the morning; that which is also dreamed by one’s neighbor; and a dream which is interpreted within a dream; to which some add, one that is dreamed by the same person twice; as it is written (Gen. 41: 32), “And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice.” . . .

Three things tranquilize the mind of man:—Melody, scenery, and sweet odor. *Three* things develop the mind of man:—A fine house, a handsome wife, and elegant furniture. The Rabbis have taught that there are *three* sorts of dropsy:—*Thick*, resulting from sin; *bloated*, in consequence of insufficient food; and *thin*, due to sorcery. . .

Food remains for *three* days in the stomach of the dog, because God knew that his food would be scanty. . . .

He who is born on the *third* day of the week will be rich and amorous. . . . There are *three* whom the Holy One—blessed be He!—abhorreth; He who says one thing but thinks another; he who might bear witness in favor of his neighbor but refrains from doing so, and he who, having seen his neighbor act disgracefully, goes and appears *singly* as a witness against him. (Thus only condemning but not convicting him, as the law requires two witnesses.) As, for example, when Toviah transgressed and Zigud appeared against him singly, before Rav Pappa, and Rav Pappa ordered this witness to receive forty stripes save one in return. “What!” said he, “*Toviah has sinned, and should Zigud be flogged?*” “Yes,” replied the Rabbi, “for by testifying singly against him thou bringest him only into repute.” (Deut. 19: 15.). .

Beware of these *three* things:—do not sit too much, for it brings on hemorrhoids; do not stand too much, for it is bad for the heart, do not walk too much, for it is hurtful to the eyes. But sit a *third*, stand a *third*, and walk a *third*. . .

Three things weaken the strength of man:—Fear, travel, and sin. Fear, as it is written (Ps. 38: 10), “My heart palpitates, my strength faileth me.” Travel, as it is written (Ps. 102: 23), “He hath weakened my strength in the way.” . . . Sin, as it is written (Ps. 31: 10), “My strength faileth me because of my iniquity.” . . .

Abraham was *three* years old when he first learned to

know his Creator; as it is said (Gen. 26: 5), "Because (בְּקָרָע) Abraham obeyed my voice."¹

Over *three* does God weep every day:—Over him who is able to study the law but neglects it; over him who studies it amidst difficulties hard to overcome; and over the ruler who behaves arrogantly towards the community he should protect.

The Rabbis teach that there are *three* that have a share in a man; God, and his father and mother. The father's part consists of all that is white in him—the bones, the veins, the nails, the brain, and the white of the eye. The mother's part consists of all that is red in him—the skin, the flesh, the hair, and the black part of the eye. God's part consists of the breath, the soul, the physiognomy, sight and hearing, speech, motive power, knowledge, understanding and wisdom. And when the time comes that man should depart from the world God takes away His part and leaves those which belong to the father and mother. Rav Pappa says, "This is the meaning of the proverb, 'Shake off the salt and throw the flesh to the dogs.'"²

Mr. Hershon continues in this wise to cite quotations in which numbers ranging to a million and upwards occur. The following are only a few of the more interesting ones.

A male hyena after *seven* years becomes a bat; this after *seven* years, a vampire; this after *seven* years a nettle; this after *seven* years more, a thorn; and this again after *seven* years is turned into a demon. If a man does not devoutly bow during the repetition of the daily prayer which commences, "we reverently acknowledge," his spine after *seven* years becomes a serpent.

The following quotation illustrates Jewish loyalty to their God. Once a Jewish mother with her *seven* sons suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Emperor. The sons, when ordered by the latter to do homage to the idols of the Empire,

¹ The conclusion arrived at here is founded on interpreting the Hebrew letters of the word rendered "because" numerically, in which פ = 70, ב = 100, ק = 2, making a total of one hundred and seventy-two; so that the sense of the text is, "Abraham obeyed my voice one hundred and seventy-two years. Now Abraham died when he was a hundred and seventy-five, therefore he must have been only *three* when he began to serve the Lord."

² Rashi's explanatory note is this: "Shake off the salt from the flesh and it becomes fit only for dogs. The soul is the salt which preserves the body; when it departs the body putrefies."

declined, and justified their disobedience by quoting each a simple text from the sacred Scriptures. When the *seventh* was brought forth, it is related that Caesar, for appearance sake, offered to spare him if only he would stoop and pick up a ring from the ground which had been dropped on purpose. "Alas for thee, O Caesar!" answered the boy; "if thou art so zealous for thine honor, how much more zealous ought we to be for the honor of the Holy One—blessed be He!" On his being led away to the place of execution, the mother craved and obtained leave to give him a farewell kiss. "Go, my child," said she, "and say to Abraham, Thou didst build an altar for the sacrifice of one son, but I have erected altars for *seven* sons." She then turned away and threw herself down headlong from the roof and expired, when the echo of a voice was heard exclaiming (Ps. 113: 9), "The joyful mother of children" (or, the mother of the children rejoiceth).

The next quotation reminds us of some of the medieval prescriptions for diseases.

For tertian fever take *seven* small grapes from *seven* different vines; *seven* threads from *seven* different pieces of cloth; *seven* nails from *seven* different bridges; *seven* handfuls of ashes from *seven* different fire-places; *seven* bits of pitch from *seven* ships, one piece from each; *seven* scrapings of dust from as many separate doorways; *seven* cummin seeds; *seven* hairs from a lower jaw of a dog, and tie them upon the throat with a papyrus fibre.

Here is an account of the juggling powers of some of the Tanaim. It is related of Rabbi Shimon, the son of Gamaliel, that at the rejoicing during the festival of the drawing of water on the Feast of Tabernacles, he threw *eight* flaming torches, one after the other in quick succession into the air, and caught them again as they descended without suffering one to touch another. He also (in fulfillment of Ps. 102: 14) stooped and kissed the stone floor, supporting himself upon his two thumbs only,—a feat which no one else could perform. And this is what is termed stooping properly.

Levi once in the presence of Rabbi (the Holy) conjured with *eight* knives. Samuel in the presence of Shavur, the King (of Persia, Sapor I, 240-273) performed the same feat with *eight* cups of wine. Abaii in the presence of Rava did likewise with *eight* eggs; some say with four only. The curious will be interested to know how God spends his days.

Twelve hours there are in the day:—The first three, the Holy One—blessed be He!—employs in studying the law, the next three He sits and judges the *whole* world; the third three He spends in feeding *all* the world; during the last three hours He sports with the leviathan; as it is said (Ps. 104: 26), “This leviathan Thou hast created to play with it.” (During the night we are told that He rides on a swift cherub over eighteen thousand worlds.)

The following will be interesting to pedagogues.

Twenty-five children is the highest number there should be in a class for elementary instruction. There should be an assistant appointed, if there be forty in number, and if fifty, there should be two competent teachers. Rava says, “If there be two teachers in a place, one teaching the children more than the other, the one that teaches less is not to be dismissed, because if so, the other is liable to lapse into negligence also.” Rav Deimi of Nehardaa, on the other hand, thinks the dismissal of the former will make the latter all the more eager to teach more, both out of fear lest he also be dismissed, and out of gratitude that he has been preferred to the other. Mar says, “the emulation of the Scribes (or teachers) increaseth wisdom.” Rava also says—“When there are two teachers, one teaching much but superficially, and one teaching thoroughly but not so much, the former is to be preferred, for the children will, in the long run, improve most by learning much.” Rav Deimi of Nehardaa, however, thinks the latter is to be preferred, for a mistake or an error once learned is difficult to unlearn; as it is written in 1 Kings 11: 16, “For six months did Joab remain there with all Israel, until he cut off every male (**זְכָר** zachar) in Edom.” When David asked Joab why he killed only the males and not the females, he replied, “Because it is written in Deut. 25: 19, ‘Thou shalt blot out (**זְכָר** zachar) the male portion of Amelek.’” “But” said David, **עַמְלָק** “We read (**זְכָר**, zeichar) ‘the remembrance of Amelek.’” To this Joab replied, “My teacher taught me to read **זְכָר**, and not **זְכָר**” (**זְכָר** and not **זְכָר**) *i.e.*, male and not remembrance. The teacher of Joab was sent for, and being found guilty of having taught his pupil in a superficial manner, he was condemned to be beheaded. The poor teacher pleaded in vain for his life, for the King’s judgment was based on Scripture (Jer. 48: 10), “Cursed be he that doeth

the work of the Lord deceitfully, and Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

That marriages are arranged in heaven may be seen from the following.

Forty days before the formation of a child a Bath Kol proclaims, "The daughter of so-and-so shall marry the son of so-and-so; the premises of so-and-so shall be the property of so-and-so."

Here is an example of Rabbinical ingenuity :

Rabbi Meir had a disciple named Sumchus, who in every case assigned *forty-eight* reasons why one thing should be called clean, and why another should be called unclean, though Scripture declared the contrary. We give the next without comment :

An egg once dropped out of a nest of a bird called Bar Yuchnei, which deluged sixty cities and swept away three hundred cedars. The question therefore arose, "Does the bird generally throw out its eggs?" Rav Ashi replied, "No; that was a rotten one."

There are very many other stories like these in the Talmud, not found in Mr. Hershon's book. The following may be found in Mr. Barclay's "The Talmud."

It is related that a Rabbi once saw in a desert a flock of geese so fat that their feathers fell off, and the rivers flowed in fat. He said to them, "Shall we have part of you in the world to come?" One of them lifted up a wing and the other a leg, to signify the parts we shall have. We should otherwise have had all parts of these geese, but that their sufferings are owing to us. It is our iniquities that have delayed the coming of the Messiah, and these geese suffer greatly by reason of their excessive fat, which daily increases, and will increase until the Messiah comes." Rabba bar Chama says that he once saw "a bird so tall that its head reached the sky, and its legs to the bottom of the ocean." The water in which it stood was so deep that a carpenter's axe which had fallen in seven years before had not yet reached the bottom. He also saw "a frog as large as a village containing sixty houses." This frog was swallowed up by a serpent, and this serpent in time by a crow; this crow flew and perched upon a cedar, and this cedar was as broad as sixteen wagons abreast. There is also an account of a fish which was killed by a worm. This fish, when driven ashore, destroyed sixty cities, and sixty cities ate of

it, and sixty cities salted it, and with its bones the ruined cities were rebuilt. Stories are also told of fishes with eyes like the moon, and of horned fishes three hundred miles in length. These stories are intended to confirm the text, “They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters; these see the works of the Lord and his wonders in the deep.” It should be added that many of these absurd stories have hidden mystical meanings which were intended only for the initiated.

This is the story of the origin of the Septuagint:

Ptolemy, the King (of Egypt) assembled *seventy-two* elders of Israel and lodged them in *seventy-two* separate chambers, but did not tell them why he did so. Then he visited each one in turn and said, “Write out for me the law of Moses your Rabbi.” The Holy One—blessed be He!—went and counselled the minds of every one of them, so that they all agreed, and wrote, “God created in the beginning” (instead of “In the beginning (he) created God,” which is the literal translation).

That the Rabbis were men of great learning may be seen from the following:

The venerable Hillel had *eighty* disciples, thirty of whom were worthy that the Shechinah should rest upon them, as it rested upon Moses our Rabbi; and thirty of them were worthy that the sun should stand still (for them), as it did for Joshua the son of Nun; and twenty of them stood midway in worth. The greatest of them all was Jonathan ben Uzziel and the least of them all was Rabbi Yochanan ben Zacchai. It is said of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zacchai that he did not leave unstudied the Bible, the Mishna, the Gemara, the constitutions, the legends, the minutiae of the law, the niceties of the scribes, the arguments *à fortiori* and from similar premises, the theory of the change of the moon, the Gematria, the parable of the unripe grapes and the foxes, the language of demons, of palm-trees, and of ministering angels.

Here is another interesting illustration of Rabbinical exegesis:

When Adam observed that his sin was the cause of the decree which made death universal he fasted *one hundred and thirty years*, abstained all that space from intercourse with his wife, and wore girdles of fig-leaves round his loins. All these years he lived under divine displeasure, and begat

devils, demons and spectres; as it is said (Gen. 5:3), "And Adam lived a *hundred and thirty* years, and begat in his own likeness, after his image," which implies that until the close of those years, his offspring was not after his own image.

Here is an account of a spirited debate among the Rabbis, in which God Himself was defeated with quotations from His own law.

There was once a dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Mishnic sages as to whether a baking oven, constructed from certain materials, and of a particular shape, was clean or unclean. The former decided that it was clean, but the latter was of a contrary opinion. Having replied to all the objections the sages had brought against his decision, and finding that they still refused to acquiesce, the Rabbi turned to them and said, "If the Halacha (the law) is according to my decision, let this carob-tree attest." Whereupon the carob-tree rooted itself up and transplanted itself to a distance of one hundred, some say *four hundred* yards from the spot. But the sages demurred and said, "We cannot admit the evidence of a carob-tree." "Well, then," said Rabbi Eleizer, "Let this running brook be a proof;" and the brook at once reversed its natural course and flowed back. The sages refused to admit this proof also. "Then let the walls of the college bear witness that the law is according to my decision;" upon which the walls began to bend, and were about to fall, when Rabbi Joshuah interposed and rebuked them saying, "If the disciples of the sages wrangle with each other in the Halacha, what is that to you? Be ye quiet!" Therefore, out of respect to Rabbi Joshuah, they did not fall, and out of respect of Rabbi Eliezer they did not resume their former upright position, but remained toppling, which they continue to do to this day. Then said Rabbi Eliezer to the sages, "Let Heaven itself testify that the Halacha is according to my judgment." And a Bath Kol, or a voice from heaven, was heard saying, "What have ye to do with Rabbi Eleizer? for the Halacha is on every point according to his decision!" Rabbi Joshuah then stood up and proved from Scripture that even a voice from heaven was not to be regarded, "For Thou, O God, didst long ago write down in the law which Thou gavest on Sinai (Exod. 23:2), 'Thou shalt follow the multitude,'" (See context.) We have it on the testimony of

Elijah the prophet, given to Rabbi Nathan on an oath, that it was with reference to this dispute about the oven God Himself confessed and said, “**נֶצְחָנוּ בְּנֵי נֶצְחָנוּ בְּנֵי**,” “My children have vanquished me! My children have vanquished me!”

The following remarkable conclusion is reached by Gematria: The precept concerning fringes is as weighty as all the other precepts put together; for it is written, says Rashi (Num. 15:39), “and remember all the commandments of the Lord.” Now the numerical value of the word **צִיצִית**, “fringes,” is *six hundred*, and this with *eight* threads and *five* knots makes *six hundred and thirteen* (the number of precepts).

The following extract shows that the Rabbis were not unacquainted with scientific apparatus.

Rabbon Gamliel had a hollow tube, through which, when he looked, he could distinguish a distance of *two thousand* cubits, whether by land or sea. By the same tube he could ascertain the depth of a valley or the height of a palm-tree.

Here is an example of *à posteriori* reasoning.

Tradition records that the ladder (mentioned Gen. 28:12) was *eighty thousand* miles wide, for it is written, “And behold the angels of God ascending and descending upon it. Angels ascending being in the plural, cannot be fewer than two at a time, and so likewise must those descending, so that when they passed they were four abreast at least. In Daniel 10:6 it is said of the angel, “His body was like Tarshish,” and there is a story that Tarshish extended *two thousand* miles.

A similar illustration, not given by Mr. Hershon, may be found in the Haggadah for Passover. It is as follows:

Rabbi Jose, the Galilean, said, “From whence art thou authorized to assert, that the Egyptians were afflicted with ten plagues in Egypt: and upon the sea they were smitten with fifty plagues?” To which he answered, “in Egypt, it is said, ‘And the magicians said unto Pharaoh, this is the finger of God;’ but at the sea it is said, ‘And Israel saw the mighty hand wherewith the Lord smote the Egyptians, etc.’” Now (Rabbi Jose argues), “If by the finger only they were smitten with ten plagues, it is deducible that in Egypt they were smitten with ten plagues; and at the sea, they were smitten with fifty plagues.

Rabbi Eliezer proves from the passage, “He sent forth

against them (1) fierceness of his anger, wrath, (2) indignation, (3) trouble, (4) and evil angels," that every plague consisted of four different plagues, and therefore in Egypt they were afflicted with forty plagues, and at the sea with two hundred plagues.

Here is a little Talmudic demonology. Abba Benjamin says, "If our eye were permitted to see the malignant spirits that beset us, we could not rest on account of them." Abaii has said, "They outnumber us, they surround us as the earthed-up soil on our garden-beds." Rav Hunna says, "Every one has a *thousand* at his left side and *ten thousand* at his right." (Ps. 91:7.) Rava adds, "The crowding at the schools is caused by their pushing in; they cause the weariness which the Rabbis experience in their knees, and even wear out their clothes by rubbing against them. If one would discover the traces of their presence let him sift some ashes upon the floor at his bedside, and next morning he will see as it were, the footmarks of fowls on the surface. But if one would see the demons themselves, he must burn to ashes the afterbirth of a first-born black kitten, and then put a little of the ashes into his eyes, and he will not fail to see them, etc."

These brief disjointed extracts taken out of their proper settings can only give, as has already been said, a very meagre and inadequate conception of the twelve folio volumes of the Talmud, but they will at least indicate the wide cyclopedic range of subjects treated, and will enable the reader to see the fairness of Mr. Barclay's estimate when he says, "Some of its sayings are of touching beauty. . . . and some are blasphemous. But mixed up as they are together, they form an extraordinary monument of 'human industry, human wisdom, and human folly.'" But what interests us most of all is that the Rabbis claimed, and the orthodox Jews of to-day believe, that the Talmud is as sacred as the Pentateuch itself, and that it was taught to Moses during his forty days stay on Mount Sinai, which is proven by Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish from the passage, "And I will give thee tablets of stone, and the law, and the commandment, which I have written to teach them (Exod. 24:12). . . . 'Tables,' says the Rabbi, 'are the Decalogue, 'law' is the Scripture, and 'the commandments' is the Mishna; 'which I have written' is the Prophets and the Hagiographa; 'to teach them;' that is the Gemara; and this teaches us that all these were given

to Moses on Sinai, and 'are the words of the living God.' " In other words the Talmud is the unfolding of the Scripture, the full grown flower of which the latter was the bud. The Talmud, therefore, is even of greater value than the Scripture. If the latter be compared to water say the Rabbis, the Mishna is wine, and the Gemara mulled wine, or if it be compared to salt, the Mishna is pepper, and the Gemara is spice, and so on. Rav goes so far as to say that "He who leaves a matter of Halachah for a matter of Scripture shall nevermore have peace ;" to which the Shemuel adds, "Aye, and he who also leaves the Talmud for the Mishna." Rabbi Yochanan says, "The words of the scribes are more highly valued than the words of the law ;" and Rabbi Chanina adds, "The words of the elders are more important than the words of the prophets."

We thus see how the sturdy oak which grew up in the wilderness and was transplanted into Palestine and cared for by the great Prophets and inspired teachers became in time completely covered and hidden from view by the clinging vines, which gradually sapped its life-giving forces and appropriated to themselves the honor and reverence due their supporter.¹ "It is," as Richard Baxter well said, "the devil's last method to undo by overdoing."

In vain did the early Prophets thunder against the substitution of legalism, letter-worship, sacrifices, and burnt offerings for true religiosity.² In vain did that great religious genius and reformer reprove the scribes and Pharisees whom he compared to "whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful, but are within full of dead *men's* bones, and of all uncleanness."³ In vain did he warn his disciples and adherents against following after them, against having Rabbis, or fathers, or masters ; against making a fetich of the letter of the law rather than observing as sacred its spirit.—"The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive." We say in vain, because all these perversions are still among us as they were twenty centuries ago. One half the Christian world still adores an infallible Pope, and a large part of the other half still believes in the infallibility and literal Divine Authorship of the Bible, the writers of Scripture being regarded,

¹ See Farrar: *Hist. of Interpretation*, pp. 48-49.

² See I Sam. 15: 22; Ps. 51: 16; Is. 1: 11; Amos 5: 21, 22; Jer. 7, 22, 23; Mic. 6: 6-9. Ezek. 20: 25.

³ Matt. 23: 27. See also Tolstoy: *Essays and Letters*. pp. 300 ff.

as they were in the 17th century "Amanuenses of God, hands of Christ, Scribes and notaries of the Holy Spirit, living and writing pens."¹ It is interesting to note that the Mohammedans make similar claims for the Koran.

THE QABALA.

The Mishna and the Gemara, however, were not the only vines which strangled the Bible and robbed it of its birth-right. There were others as strong and more vicious than the former, namely, the Midrashim, "of which the most celebrated are nothing but catenae of Talmudic passages," and the Qabala or Kabbalah, which was the esoteric Jewish doctrine. The word Qabala signifies "a thing received," in other words tradition. The claims of the Qabala as regarding its origin and development are even more extravagant than that of the Talmud. According to its followers, Dr. Ginsburg tells us in his *Essay on the Kabbalah*, "The Kabbalah was first taught by God himself to a select company of angels, who formed a theosophic school in Paradise. After the Fall the angels most graciously communicated this heavenly doctrine to the disobedient child of earth, to furnish the protoplasts with the means of returning to their pristine nobility and felicity. From Adam it passed over to Noah, and then to Abraham, the friend of God, who emigrated with it to Egypt, where the patriarch allowed a portion of this mysterious doctrine to ooze out. It was in this way that the Egyptians obtained some knowledge of it, and the other Eastern nations could introduce it into their philosophical systems. Moses, who was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, was first initiated into the Kabbalah in the land of his birth, but became most proficient in it during his wanderings in the wilderness, where he not only devoted to it the leisure hours of the whole forty years, but received lessons in it from one of the angels. By the aid of this mysterious science the lawgiver was enabled to solve the difficulties which arose during his management of the Israelites, in spite of the pilgrimages, wars, and frequent miseries of the nation. He covertly laid down the principles of this secret doctrine in the first four books of Pentateuch, but withheld them from Deuteronomy. Moses also initiated the

¹ See Farrar: *loc. cit.*, p. 373.

seventy elders into the secrets of this doctrine, and they again transmitted them from hand to hand. Of all who formed the unbroken line of tradition, David and Solomon were the most deeply initiated into the Kabbalah. No one, however, dared to write it down, till Schimeon ben Jochai, who lived at the time of the destruction of the second temple. . . . After his death, his son, Rabbi Eleazar, and his secretary, Rabbi Abba, as well as his disciples, collated Rabbi Schimeon ben Jochai's treatises, and out of these composed the celebrated work called *Z H R, Zohar*, 'splendor,' which is the grand storehouse of Kabbalism.'¹

The Qabala, though usually classified under the headings, practical, literal, unwritten, and dogmatic, may for convenience sake be divided into the symbolical and real Qabala. The symbolical Qabala, divided into the three parts, "Gematria," "Notricon," "Temurah" teaches how the secrets and mysteries of the Bible may be discovered and understood. Before proceeding to explain each of these parts, it is necessary to remind the reader that in Hebrew, as in Greek, there are no separate numerical characters, hence each letter has its own numerical value, and therefore every word is a number and every number can be converted into a letter or word. The Gematria is based on this correspondence between words and numbers.

The briefest and clearest exposition of the rules and principles of these three parts which we have seen is given by Mr. Hershon. We can do no better, therefore, than quote him in full.

"Let us assume for the nonce," he says in explaining Gematria, "that a standard numerical value is attached to each letter in the *English* alphabet. A has the value of 1, B 2, C 3, D 4, E 5, F 6, G 7, H 8, I 9, J 10, K 20, L 30, M 40, N 50, O 60, P 70, Q 80, R 90, S 100, T 200, U 300, V 400, W 500, X 1,000, Y 10,000, Z 100,000. And let us now assume a point in dispute in order to illustrate how it is solved by Gematria. Suppose that the subject of discussion is the comparative superiority of the Hebrew and English languages, and Hugo and Baruch are the disputants. The former being a Hebrew, holds that the Hebrew is superior to the English, 'because,' says he, 'the numerical value of the letters that form the word *Hebrew* is 610;

¹ Quoted by S. L. McGregor Mathers: "The Kabbalah Unveiled."

whereas the numerical value of English is only 209.' The latter being an Englishman, holds, of course, exactly the contrary opinion, and argues as follows: 'All the learned world must admit that the *English* is a *living language*, but not so the Hebrew; and it is written (Eccles. 9:4) that 'A living dog is better than a dead lion,' I therefore maintain that the English is superior to the Hebrew. 'The dispute was referred to an Oxford authority for decision, and a certain learned doctor decided it by—"Notricon." This consists in forming a decisive sentence composed of words whose initial letters are in a given word; for instance, Hebrew: 'Hugo's *e* xcels *B* aruch's *r* easoning *e* very *w* ay.' English: *E* nglish *n* o *g* ood *l* anguage, *i* ss scarcely *h* armonious; but Hebrew: 'Holy, *e* legant, *b* rilliant, *r* esonant, *e* liciting *w* onder!' This is a fair specimen of how to get at the secret sense of a word by the rule of Notricon,' and now we will proceed to explain "Temurah."

But before he proceeds it is necessary to add that there is another form of Notricon which is the exact reverse of that which he has given. In this form, the initials or finals, or both, or the medials, of a sentence are taken to form a word or words. "Thus the Qabala is called Chokhmah Nesethrah, "the secret wisdom," and if we take the initials of these two words, Ch and N, we form by the second kind of Notricon the word ChN, Chen, "grace." Similarly from the initials and finals of the words MI IOHL LNV HSH MIMH, Mi Iaulah Leno Ha-Shama-yimah, "Who shall go up for us to heaven?" (Deut. 30:12), are formed MILH, Milah, "circumcision," and IHVH, the Tetragrammaton, implying that God hath ordained circumcision as the way to heaven."¹

Temurah means permutation. "According to certain rules, one letter is substituted for another letter preceding or following it in the alphabet, and thus from one word another word of totally different orthography may be formed. Thus the alphabet is bent exactly in half in the middle, and one half is put over the other; and then by changing alternately the first letter or the first two letters at the beginning of the second line, twenty-two commutations are produced. These are called the "Table of the Combinations of TZIRVP." Tziruph.

¹ S. L. MacGregor Mathers : The Kabbalah Unveiled, p. 9.

The following will illustrate one of these twenty-two methods, called ALBTH, *Albath*.

K I T Ch Z V H D G B A
M N S O P Tz Q R Sh Th L

This is the order in which the Hebrew alphabet runs, reading the first line from right to left, the second from left to right, with the exception of L which belongs between K and M. Now if by Albath we wished to write, "Thou shalt not kill," we should have to substitute for Th, B; for O, Ch; for U, Tz; and so on, getting the following result; BChTz GLAS IChS MNAA.

Besides these combinations there is another set of twenty-two combinations known as the "Rational Table of Tziruph," three "Tables of the Commutations," known respectively as the Right, the Averse, and the Irregular; the method called ThShRQ, Thashraq, which is simply writing a word backwards, and the "Qabala of the Nine Chambers."

In addition to all this "there are certain meanings hidden in the *shape* of the letters; in the form of a particular letter at the end of a word being different from that which it generally bears when it is a final letter, or in a letter being written in the middle of a word in a character generally used only at the end; in any letter or letters being written in a size smaller or larger than the rest of the manuscript, or in a letter being written upside down; in the variations found in the spelling of certain words, which have a letter more in some places than they have in others; in peculiarities observed in the position of any of the points or accents, and in certain expressions supposed to be elliptic or redundant."¹

The Real Qabala consists of theoretical and practical mysteries. The theoretical mysteries treat about the ten spheres, the four worlds, the essence and various names of God and of angels, also of the celestial hierarchy and its influences and effects on this lower world, of the mysteries of creation, of the Maaseh Merkaba, the mystical chariot described by the Prophet Ezekiel, of the different orders and offices of angels and demons, also of a great many other deep subjects, too deep for the comprehension of the unlearned.

The practical Qabala is a branch of the theoretical, and treats of the practical use of the mysterious names of God and of angels. By uttering properly the Shem-hammepho-

¹ MacGregor: *loc. cit.*, p. 11.

rash, *i. e.*, the ineffable name of Jehovah, or the names of certain angels, or by the mere repetition of certain Scripture texts, miracles and wonders were and still are performed in the Jewish world.¹¹

It may be interesting to know that the orthodox Jews claim that Christ performed his miracles by the use of the Shem-hammephorash. A few quotations, and we shall have done with the Qabala.

In Gen. 49:10 "Shiloh come," IBA ShILH is equivalent to 358, and that is also the numerical value of MShICH, Mashiach. Shiloh is therefore identified with the Messiah. Again, because the letters Mashiach and of Nachash, "Serpent," are isopsephic, they said that it was the Messiah who would bruise the serpent's head.

In Gen. 25:21, the letters of the Hebrew word for 'his wife' AShTV, *Eshtoi* have the value of 707, which is the equivalent of the words, ASh VQSh, Ash Vakosh, "fire and straw," and is at once mystically connected with Obadiah, verse 11, "the house of Jacob shall be a fire . . . and the house of Esau of stubble." . . . Because the letters of Eliezer's name have the value of 318 it was inferred that he alone was equal to all the other 318 servants of Abraham. . . . Because in Is. 30:18, "Blessed are all those that wait upon Him," the value of the word "upon Him," LV, *Loi* is 36, therefore there are never less than 36 righteous in the world. . . . Likewise there are 70 nations of the world because "Gog and Magog" give the number 70; and there are 903 ways of dying because the word for "issues of death," in Ps. 48:21 ThVTzAVTh gives the number 903. . . . The length of a Nazarite's vow might be limited to 30 days, because in Num. 6:5, "he shall be holy," the word "he shall be" IHIH gives the number 30. . . . There are 98 ways of explaining the law, because in Cant. 2:4 the word for "and his banner" VDGLV gives the number 49. . . . The law had 613 precepts because the word for 'incense' QTRTh gives 613 The Day of Atonement was the only day of the year on which Satan could bring no accusation because the word HSTN, Hassatan gives only 364. . . .

Moses did not marry an Ethiopian woman (Kushith) but

¹¹ Hershon: A Talmudic Miscellany, p. 321.

a "beautiful" woman, since Kushith yields the number 736 which is equivalent to "fair of form," IPhTh-MRAH.¹

"All the inhabitants of the earth were of one language." Gen. 11:1. Here AChTh, *One*, = 409, and is equivalent to HQDSh = 409; whence it was assumed that Hebrew was the primitive tongue. . . .

Gen. 42:2, "Go down," RDV = 210. Therefore the Egyptian bondage lasted 210 years. . . .

Know thou that the 613 Precepts of the Law form a compact with the Holy One—blessed be He! and with Israel, as it is often explained in the Zohar. It is written (Exod. 3:15) ZH ShMI VZH ZChRI, *Ze Shime Vaze Zichri*, "This is My name, and this is My memorial." ShMI OM IH, "My name," together with "Yeho," amounts numerically to 365; VH OM ZChRI, "Vah" together with "My memorial" amounts to 248. Here we have the number 613 in the Holy One—blessed be He! . . . The soul is a portion of God from above, and this is mystically intimated by the degrees of RVCh NPhSh NShMH, Ruach, Nephesh, Nashomo, "breath, spirit, soul," the initial and final letters of which amount to 613, while the middle letters of these amount to the number of YHVH ShDI ALHIM, "Jehovah, Almighty, Elohim." . . . The soul of Moses our Rabbi—peace be on him!—embraced all the souls of Israel; as it is said, Moses was equivalent to all Israel. MShH RBINV, "Moses our Rabbi," amounts to 613, and YHVH ALHI YSRAL, "Lord God of Israel," also amounts to 613.²

These are sufficient to illustrate Gematria. Here are a few extracts to illustrate Notrikon.

Every letter in the word BRASHITH, "In the beginning," is made the initial of a word, and we obtain BRAShITH RAH ALHIM ShIQBLV IShRAL ThVRH, "In the beginning the Elohim saw that Israel would accept the law."

Solomon Meir ben Moses, a Jewish Qabalist, who embraced the Christian faith in 1665, gives six different sentences derived from the letters in BRAShITH by Notrikon. The first is BN RVCh AB ShLVShThM IChD ThMIM: "The Son, the Spirit, the Father, Their Trinity, Perfect Unity." The second is the same as the first except

¹ Farrar: *Hist. of Interpretation*, p. 98-100.

² Hershon: *A Talmudic Miscellany*, p. 322.

the last word which is ThOBVDV, "Ye shall equally worship Their Trinity." The third is BKVRI RAShVNI AShR ShMV IShVO ThOBVDV: "Ye shall worship My first-born, My first, Whose name is Jesus." The fourth is BBVA RBN AShR ShMV IShVO ThOBVDV: "When the Master shall come Whose name is Jesus ye shall worship." The fifth is, BThVLH RAVIH ABChR ShThLD IShVO ThAShRVH: "I will choose a virgin worthy to bring forth Jesus and ye shall call her blessed." The sixth is, BOVGTh RTzPIM ASThThR ShGVPI IShVO ThAKLV: "I will hide myself in cake (baked with) coals, for ye shall eat Jesus, My Body."¹ Very many learned Jews of the Middle Ages accepted Christianity because of such convincing proofs, and many Christian Fathers eagerly seized upon the Qabala because, like Mirandola, they thought they found more Christianity than Judaism in it. . . .

"The sages of truth (the Qabalists) remarked that ADM, Adam, contains the initial letters of Adam, David and Messiah, for after Adam sinned his soul passed into David, and the latter having also sinned, it passed into the Messiah."

"Know thou that Cain's soul passed into Jethro, but his spirit into Korah, and his animal soul into the Egyptian. This is what Scripture saith, "Cain," JKM JeKAM, "shall be avenged sevenfold." (Gen. 4: 24.) The letters JKM forming the word which means "shall be avenged," also form the initials of Jethro, Korah, and Mitzri, or Egyptian.

Cain had robbed the twin sister of Abel, and therefore his soul passed into Jethro. Moses was possessed by the soul of Abel, and therefore Jethro gave his daughter to Moses.² This of course is all proven by Notricon.

In Ps. 21: 2, "The king shall rejoice in Thy strength, O Lord," refers to "the Messiah" by transposing IShMCh (shall rejoice) into *Mashiach* (Messiah). In Exodus 23: 23, "My angel" MLAKI is transposed into Michael, as also is the name Malachi; "Cherem," "a ban," becomes *racham* "pity," implying that there is always room for repentance; or into *ramach*, of which the numerical equivalent is 248, showing that if a man do not repent the curse

¹ MacGregor Mathers: *The Kabbalah Unveiled*, p. 8.

² Hershon: *loc cit.*, p. 325.

will smite the 248 parts of the body. There seem to be three instances of Temura in the Bible. Thus in Jer. 25: 26, 41: 41, the word Sheshach has always been understood to be a cipher for Babel, to which by Athbash it is equivalent. No Christian interpreter had any notion what it meant till Jerome learnt the secret from his Jewish teacher. Again, in Jer. 51: 1, the meaningless expression, "*them that dwell in the midst* of them that rise up against me" becomes luminous if for *leb-kamai* we substitute by Athbash the word *kasdim*, or Chaldeans. Similarly an application of the cipher Albam, explains an otherwise mysterious name in Is. 7: 6, Ephraim, Syria, and the son of Remaliah there take evil counsel to attack Judah and set up as king "*the son of Tabeal*." Who was this Tabeal whose name never occurs elsewhere? Mr. Cheyne says that "he was evidently a Syrian; the name in *Syriac* means "*God is good*," just as Tav Rimmon means "*Rimmon is good*." Dr. Kay even conjectures that he was a descendant of Naaman, and others that he was a powerful Ephraimite, perhaps Zichri (2 Chron. 28: 7). Apply the Albam, however, and for TABL (Tabeal) we get RMLA, which may well be the same as Remaliah, either used by Isaiah as a scornful variation, or because it may have been originally the secret watchword of the powerful conspiracy.¹

“ Now let us illustrate the subject of IRAH VAHBH, ‘fear and love.’ Fear proceedeth from love and love proceedeth from fear. And this you may demonstrate by writing their letters one over the other, and then dividing them by horizontal and perpendicular lines, thus, HARI
HBHA

Love perfecteth fear, and fear perfecteth love.' This is to teach thee that both are united together."²

There are pages and pages in the "Book of Concealed Mystery" which we cannot begin to understand. The meaning of the book, as its title indicates, was purposely concealed. The contents of the "Greater Holy Assembly" will indicate its symbolic character. 1. The Ingress and Preface. 2. Of the Condition of the World of Vacancy. 3. Concerning the Ancient One, and Macroprosopus, and Concerning his Parts and especially Concerning His Skull. 4.

¹ Farrar: Hist. of Interpretation, p. 103.

² Hershon: *Talmudic Miscellany*, p. 323.

Concerning the Dew or Moisture of the Brain, of the Ancient One or Macroprosopus. 5. Further Concerning the Skull of Macroprosopus. 6. Concerning the Membrane of the Brain of Macroprosopus. 7. Concerning the hair of Macroprosopus. 8. Concerning his Forehead. 9. Eyes. 10. Nose. 11. Beard in general. 12. Concerning the Beard of Macroprosopus in Particular; and in the first place concerning its first part. 13. Concerning the second part. 14. The third part. 15. The Fourth part. 16. Fifth part. 17. Sixth part. 18. Seventh part. 19. Eighth part. 20. Ninth part. 21. Tenth and eleventh parts. 22. Twelfth part. 23. Thirteenth part. 24. Conclusion of the matter concerning Macroprosopus. Then follow twenty parallel chapters concerning Microprosopus, its eyes, nose, beard, etc. The "Lesser Holy Assembly" treats of the eyes, nose, beard, brain of the Ancient One and other subjects of equal interest and importance.

What we have here given will suffice to show how deep in the mire of bibliolatry, traditionalism, and formalism that people, who more than any other had the peculiar genius for religion, had sunk. The religion of the living heart was gradually superseded by the religion of the dead letter, the essentials were either forgotten or despised, while the trivialities and accessories, fringes and phylacteries were paid all the reverence due Jehovah Himself.

It is to this complete degeneration, however, that Christianity very likely owes its birth. The spirit of religion having been driven from the Figure of Israel, left it a mere hollow mask, while it withdrew, "and in unnoticed nooks wove for herself a new Vesture," in which she reappeared and blessed mankind. But this same Vesture, ere many centuries were passed, went again "sorrowfully out at elbows." The history of Judaism, especially the latter part, is repeated with remarkable accuracy in the Patristic and Scholastic periods of Christianity. The exegesis of the Fathers and Schoolmen is no whit less absurd and fanciful than that of the Rabbis and Kabbalists; there are no trivialities in the latter more puerile and inane than some of the questions with which the former frequently busied themselves. For example, How many angels can dance upon the point of a pin? Can angels be in two places at once? Can many angels be in the same place at once? Could Adam, when in the state of innocence, discern the essence of angels? Has local distance any effect on the

speech of angels? Is there a definite number of angels? Do they belong to the same genus, and are they composed of matter and form? Does the Father beget the Divine Essence? Does the Divine Essence beget the Son? Should it be said that Christ is *composed* or that He *consists* of two natures? Is the word "conflate," or "commixed," or "conglutinate," or "coagmentate," or "copulated," or "ferruminate" the right one to use in speaking of their union?¹ Again, like R. Aqiba, they maintained that every part of Scripture admitted of many different interpretations; some, a threefold, others a fourfold, and still others like Bonaventura an eightfold interpretation. Water, for example, may, tropologically, stand for sorrow, or wisdom, or heresies, or prosperity; allegorically, it may refer to baptism, nations, or grace; anagogically, to eternal happiness. "Let there be light" may mean historically, according to Thomas Aquinas, an act of creation; allegorically, "Let Christ be love;" anagogically, "May we be led by Christ to glory;" and, tropologically, "May we be mentally illumined by Christ."²

The seven hermeneutic rules of Hillel are paralleled by the seven rules of Tichonius, which St. Augustine indorsed so warmly, and the application of which gave all sorts of absurd and irrational results. Thus, Is. 61:10 . . . "as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments," applies to Christ, but the following clause, "and as a bride adorneth *herself* with jewels," applies only to the Church. Again, in Cant. 1:5, "I am black but comely," the first epithet refers to false Christians, the second to true Christians.³

Sunk still deeper in the mire of mad symbolism or allegory is a work written by the Bishop of Treves about the year 450, entitled *Liber Formularum Spiritalis Intelligen-
tiae*, in which, among other things, the "head of God" represents the essential divinity; the "hair" the Holy Angels or the elect; the "eyelids" His incomprehensible judgments; His "mouth" Christ; His "lips" the agreement of the Old and New Testaments, etc.⁴

Just as blind, too, was their idolization of the letter of the Book, not the original, however, but the imperfect and often arbitrary translation of the Seventy. For Tertullian,

¹ See Farrar: *loc. cit.*, pp. 291-294.

² *Ibid.*, p. 295.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

every word in the Bible was uttered by God and dictated by the Holy Ghost. Its cosmogony, chronology, anthropology, and history were infallible. So far, indeed, did his literalism take him that he inferred from such phrases as "the hand of God" the corporeality of God. This is also true of the Egyptian monks.¹ Even as late as the seventeenth century, as has been noted before, the Bible was looked upon as "a divine effluence," "a part of God," and one writer went so far as to discuss whether it could be called a creature, but concluded that it could not.

"During the whole of this (Scholastic) period," writes Farrar, "Christian exegesis resembled that of the Rabbinic school of Tiberias in its age of decadence. Both had their oral tradition with which they made the Word of God of none effect. The Fathers took the same position as the Mishna, and allegory as the Qabbala."²

"The Bible was turned into an amulet or fetich with which the hierarchy, which arrogantly usurped the name of 'the Church,' could do as they liked."³

A few citations from the Patristic and Scholastic periods will suffice. When Abraham circumcised his 318 servants he had Christ in mind, according to Barnabas, for the number may be represented by the letters T I H, of which T stands for the Cross, and I H for Ihsous (Jesus).⁴ "The land flowing with milk and honey," he interprets, "in accordance with true gnosis" to mean "Trust in Jesus." "The land" stands for "man;" "milk" for "the word;" and "honey" for "faith."⁵ . . . Of Justin Martyr, Middleton says rather significantly, "he applied all the sticks and pieces of wood in the Old Testament, to the Cross."⁶ . . . Jacob and Noah he regarded as types of Christ and numerous passages throughout the Old Testament pointed for him to the Saviour and proved His divinity. In this he was followed by very many of the later Fathers. The biblical story of Rebecca's coming to the well and meeting Abraham's servant is, according to Origen, a hidden way of reminding us that we must daily come to the wells of Scripture in order to meet with Christ.⁷ . . . The phrase "the Lord opened the eyes of Agar" is but an allegorical method

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

² *Ibid.*, p. 215.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

of alluding to the blindness of the Jewish Synagogue.¹ . . . The Ark was coated within and without with pitch in order to show, according to St. Augustine, the safety of the Church from inward and outward heresies. . . . The drunkenness of Noah is "a figure of the death and passion of Christ."² . . . When the Psalmist said, "I laid me down and slept, and rose up again," he had allusion, St. Augustine tells us, to the Death and Resurrection of Christ.³ . . . Albertus Magnus busied himself discovering reasons why it was necessary for an angel to announce to Mary the immaculate conception, and not for God to be His own messenger.⁴ "Let not the foot of pride come against me." Why "foot" and not "feet?" asked Albertus. Because, he says, "he who walks on one foot falls more easily than he who walks on two."⁵ . . . "The mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk." The mountains, he says, means the heights of the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity, or even the heights of the Apostles; and the hills, that is the heights of the angels and saints, shall flow with the truth of the white sweet doctrine of the Humanity of Christ.⁶ . . . Thomas Aquinas's method of explaining a passage was to hunt through the Scripture for passages containing the same prominent word as the one he wishes to explain. Thus when "washing" is spoken of "he collects the texts and says we are washed by water of baptism (Acts 22:16); by tears of contrition (Luke 7:38); by the wine of Divine love (Gen. 49:11); by the milk of the Divine word (Cant. 5:12); with the blood of the Passion (1 Cor. 6:11); and with a view to our correction (John 13:5). . . . Again "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse." The Blessed Virgin, he says, is "a rod." (1) As *consoling* in tribulation, which he illustrates by the *rod* of Moses dividing the Red Sea. (2) As *fructifying*, because Aaron's *rod* budded. (3) As *satiating*, because the *rod* of Moses drew water from the rock. (4) As *scourging*, because a *rod* was to smite the corners of Moab. (5) As *watching*, because in Jer. 1:11, we read in the Vulgate *Virgam vigilantem ego video.*⁷ . . . Surely, this is symbolism gone mad. Bonaventura expatiates on the length,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

² *Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 287-288.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

breadth, height and width of Scripture; he says, that its altitude is unattainable because of its inviolable authority, its plenitude inexhaustible because of its inscrutable profundity, its certitude infallible because of its irrefutable progress, its value inappreciable because of its inestimable fruit, its pulchritude incontaminable because of its impermixtible purity, and so forth with all the inexhaustible veracity of scholastic eloquence, and with an artificiality which lacks the ring of genuine feeling.¹

From the above it will be seen how just is the remark of Farrar, when he says, "Spinning out of their own subjectivity by the aid of objections, solutions, definitions, conclusions, corollaries, propositions, proofs, replies, reasons, refutations, exceptions, and distinctions, they weave, as Bacon said, interminable webs, "marvellous for the tenacity of the thread and workmanship, but for any useful purpose trivial and inane. . . . Langenstein in four large folios had only got to the fourth chapter of Genesis, and more real elucidation of the meaning could probably be given in four lines. Hasselbach wrote twenty-four books on the first chapter of Isaiah, and an indefinitely truer conception of its meaning could be furnished in two pages.²

These trivial and useless labors, not directly harmful in themselves, perhaps, are for the religious pathologist, positive prognostic symptoms of the decadence and corruption of religion and morals. It could have been justly said in the period preceding the Reformation that no religion had ever sunk so low, because none had ever risen so high as did Christianity. The literature of the time, atheistic, protestant, and even Catholic is full of strong denunciations of the immorality, hypocrisy, and charlatanry of the Popes, the terrible degeneration of the Church, and the baneful influence of both on the lives of the people.³

But Christianity was not doomed to die an ignoble death. The glowing sparks were seized from the smouldering ruins by the Waldenses, John Hus, John Wessel, Wyclif, Luther, Erasmus, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Calvin, and kindred spirits, and made to kindle new fires, which warmed and revived the almost frozen body of Christianity. Very soon, however, these fires began to burn low and were nearly extinguished in the period which was variously and significantly

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

² *Ibid.*, p. 289.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 307-311.

designated as the age of "Symbolatry," of "creed bondage," of "Lutheran patristics," of "Protestant scholasticism," of Dogmatic traditionalism," of "death orthodoxy," of "theorizing system" of "ecclesiastico-confessional," of "polemico-dogmatic interpretation."¹

Once more the fires were rekindled by religious leaders in England, Germany, and France, and since then they have been burning with less heat, perhaps, but certainly shedding more light on the path along which humanity is slowly trudging toward the distant goal. In religion as in government, "experience hath shown," to conclude with the immortal words of our Declaration of Independence, "that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security."

Christianity was a religious Declaration of Independence against Jewish sacerdotalism and formalism, Protestantism was another such Declaration against Catholic sacerdotalism and formalism, and since then there has happily been a gradual, healthy evolution which is full of promise for the future.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

CHAPTER V.

THE INTELLECTUAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

In the preceding chapters, while treating primarily of the emotions, it was impossible to entirely eliminate the intellectual element. Indeed, looked at from a different point of view, much that was there written might with almost equal propriety be included in this chapter. The emotional life is so wrapped up with the intellectual and volitional that it is only by artificial abstraction and a schematism that is too often misleading, that we can separate them.

In the discussion of the definitions of religion it was pointed out that the emotions alone could not entirely account for religion. The animal or human mother loving her offspring, for example, the husband his wife, the youth his mistress, the child feeling its dependence upon its parents, fearing the dark, pitying a sick or wounded animal, amazed and bewildered at the conjuror's tricks, etc., are no more religious in the strict sense of the term than are the philanthropists and moralists who labor in the interest of their unfortunate fellow beings, or the church-goers who conform outwardly to all the forms and ceremonies, but who are inwardly dead or indifferent to religion. "But Israel," said Paul, "which followed after the law of righteousness hath not attained to the law of righteousness . . . because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." And Luther, in anger, pronounced the writings of St. James an "epistle of straw" because the latter considered good works more valuable than mere faith.

Again, reason and its products,—theology, creeds, and dogmas—do not constitute the whole of religion. Religion may be, and often is reasonable, but it does not therefore follow that reason is religion or even the beginning of religion. Reason is one and only one of the many streams which feed the great ocean; it is not the ocean itself.

The mathematician who has succeeded in solving a difficult problem, the philosopher who has struggled with the

great Mystery and attained a *Weltanschauung*, the scientist who labors patiently in his laboratory in the pursuit of truth, are, as pure and simple mathematicians, philosophers, or scientists, not religious. There is, of course, a sense in which no one is more religious than the enthusiastic seeker after truth, but such a one is no longer a mere thinking machine but a human being with a will and feelings, interests and ideals, as well as a logical mind. It is still a mooted question whether Buddhism should be called a religion or a philosophy. The enthusiastic Buddhist is undoubtedly religious, the lukewarm or indifferent one is more philosopher than religionist. Mr. Benjamin Kidd even goes so far as to say that, "a rational religion is a scientific impossibility, representing from the nature of the case, an inherent contradiction of terms."¹ This, however, is an extreme and untenable view due, perhaps, to Mr. Kidd's narrow conception of religion. We believe, on the contrary, that the religion of the future will be rational and even scientific; science itself will become religious, and a mere collection and enumeration of dry facts will be but a means to a higher religious end. The old slogan "Science for science sake" is now rapidly becoming absurd, and in its stead the loftier ideal, science for a fuller and better life's sake, is being gradually substituted. That a new dispensation is not far distant there can be but little doubt.²

Returning to religion we repeat that it is a well-balanced, psycho-physical reaction in which all the soul elements participate. The emotions stimulate the intellect and give the will work to do, and these in their turn regulate the emotions and keep them within their proper bounds. Like the wheels of a clock, each in performing its own task helps the others to do the same.

This brings us to the question, What is the intellect's rôle in religion? or in other words, What are the functions of knowledge and belief? But before we can answer this question we must first know what belief is. Belief may be tentatively defined as the voluntary acceptance of, or acquiescence in, a statement or theory without having or demanding sufficient proof of its verity; or, as the Apostle defined it, it is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of

¹ Social Evolution.

² See Pres. G. Stanley Hall, *Science*, Oct. 14, 1904; also his new *Journal of Religious Psych. and Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

things not seen." We *know*, for instance, that two and two are the same as four, that things equal to the same thing are equal to each other, and other mathematical axioms, but we do not know with equal certainty that the nebular hypothesis or the atomic theory is true; that there is such a substance as ether: or, as Kant showed in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, that there is an external world, that we possess a soul, or that there is a God. We can only believe these assertions to be true; we cannot know or prove them to be true. There is, however, sufficient evidence to warrant our holding these beliefs as such until they are proven to be erroneous. The nebular hypothesis and the atomic and ether theories harmonize well with our present knowledge of the universe and its laws, and the belief in a soul and a God is, for the most of us, at least, a psychical necessity. The Practical Reason must postulate them in order to function normally, because so many of our hopes and so much of our lives are built upon them. We could not live happily without them. Our passionnal nature wills to believe these postulates, and the intellect is powerless to prevent us.

Normal belief, however, must be in harmony with the other beliefs which the individual and his clan or race entertain. That is, it must have some semblance of truth as they understand it, or as Prof. James would say, the hypotheses must be *live* ones. For a scientist to believe in evolution six days in the week, and in the early chapters of Genesis on the seventh, is as irrational as it would be for a Jew or Mohammedan to deny and profess Christianity for similar periods of time. One group of beliefs must not contradict or do violence to another group, otherwise there will be mental instability and confusion issuing into anarchic conflicts and disorders which mean insanity. Religious beliefs must be consistent and congruous with the other beliefs the individual entertains.

Again, for an adult living in a modern civilized community to believe that the earth is flat, four cornered, and stationary, when he who runs may read the truth, is as abnormal, if not more so, as it would have been for one living in the days before Copernicus to believe the reverse. The question now naturally arises, What shall we say of Copernicus himself? Was he abnormal? Most certainly he was in the eyes of his contemporaries, and if we take them as a standard, as we should, we must render the same verdict. We

now know that he was far in advance of his time, and therefore prefer to regard him as supernormal—a genius ; but the generation which gave him birth could not judge him other than they did. The human mind is fallible, of course, and ever growing ; what is considered abnormal to-day may be considered perfectly normal a century or a decade hence, and many of our present day ‘cranks’ and ‘faddists’ may occupy prominent niches in some future hall of fame. But this knowledge of our fallibility does not deter us from forming opinions to-day. And our opinions are true ones for the time being, for truth itself is dynamic not static, a growth subject to the laws of evolution.¹

It will be seen that we consider normal what was considered such by the race and age which gave it birth, so long as their beliefs did not lead to practices detrimental to the physical and psychical health of the people who entertained them. It is unfair and unscientific to arbitrarily assume any age or religion as a standard by which to measure all other ages and religions. Noah, it is said, was a just man and perfect in his generation, and therefore he found grace in the eyes of the Lord. The same Noah to-day would certainly be considered far from perfect, and might be imprisoned for some of his deeds, but it would be unjust to judge him according to our present standards. Unfortunately this patent fact has too often been overlooked by Christian writers, and consequently their painstaking and scholarly works have but little scientific value. They seem to blame the ancient Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, Chinese, and others because they were not Christians ; are unable to enter into sympathetic rapport with their views and practices, and therefore fail to properly evaluate the productions of these ancient, non-Christian peoples.

We have already indirectly shown how a pathological condition of the emotions influences the intellect and the will and is instrumental in bringing about pathological beliefs and practices. There remains to be treated here another class of beliefs which we may consider pathological, namely, the religious beliefs of early medieval, and we might almost add, modern Christendom concerning disease.

These beliefs and practices obtained among all primitive

¹ See a good essay on Reason in Religion by C. C. Everett in his Essays, Theological and Literary, pp. 1-29, and Schiller's chapter on Truth in his New Humanism.

and ancient peoples, but with them we cannot consider it pathological. The early mind of man which saw wonders and miracles in everything and knew not the meaning of law, necessarily regarded disease as one of the great mysteries, as the hidden work of some malignant demon or an angry God. In other words, it was the product of unknown and supernatural causes. Now it would be absurd to expect them, holding the views they did, which were natural and normal to their stage of development, to look for natural remedies for their diseases. Since diseases came from gods or demons, only they could remove them. Hence, the direct appeals to them through prayer, penitence, and sacrifices, and the indirect appeals through those, who on account of their holiness or superior knowledge or psychical peculiarities were more likely to succeed in their intercessions for the sufferers. The first physicians were, as is well known, priests and shamans, and they have continued such until quite recent times. Now this was as it should have been in primitive and ancient times; but when we meet with it in early and late Christianity, many centuries after the immortal Hippocrates had by his wonderful researches laid a broad and deep scientific foundation for the development of medical science, upon which the School of Alexandria, especially such men as Herophilus and Erasistratus, built additional storeys, we must consider it arrested development and pathological.

The following excerpts from the second volume of Andrew D. White's "History of the warfare of Science with Theology" will be interesting in this connection. "The Gnostic and Manichaean struggles," writes this author, "had ripened the theologic idea that, although at times diseases are punishments by the Almighty, the main agency in them is Satanic. The great fathers and renowned leaders of the early church accepted and strengthened this idea. Origen said: "It is demons which produce famine, unfruitfulness, corruptions of the air, pestilences; they hover concealed in clouds in the lower atmosphere, and are attracted by the blood and incense which the heathen offer to them as gods." St. Augustine said: "All diseases of Christians are to be ascribed to these demons; chiefly do they torment fresh-baptized Christians, yea, even the guiltless, new born infants." Tertullian insisted that a malevolent angel is in constant attendance upon every person. Gregory of Nazi-

anzus declared that bodily pains are provoked by demons, and that medicines are useless, but that they are often cured by the laying on of consecrated hands. St. Nilus and St. Gregory of Tours, echoing St. Ambrose (who declared that "the precepts of medicine are contrary to celestial science, watching and prayer"), gave examples to show the sinfulness of resorting to medicine instead of trusting to the intercession of the Saints. St. Bernard, in a letter to certain monks, warned them that to seek relief from disease in medicine was in harmony neither with their religion nor with the honor and purity of their order. This view even found its way into the canon law, which declared the precepts of medicine contrary to Divine Knowledge. As a rule, the leaders of the Church discouraged the theory that diseases are due to natural causes, and most of them deprecated a resort to surgeons and physicians rather than to supernatural means."¹

But what were these non-medical, supernatural means? Prayers and self mortifications, answered the Church, and especially sacred reliques from which she derived enormous revenues. "Every cathedral, every great abbey, and nearly every parish church claimed possession of healing reliques."

In such environments it can readily be seen that there was no room for physicians nor any possibility for the development of medical science. "It would be expecting too much from human nature to imagine that pontiffs who derived large revenues from the sale of the Agnus Dei, or priests who derived both wealth and honors from cures wrought at shrines under their care, or lay dignitaries who had invested heavily in reliques, should favor the development of any science which undermined their interests."²

Even when the supposed reliques of sacred Saints were proved to be fraudulent, the belief of the masses in them was not lessened. "When Prof. Buckland, the eminent osteologist and geologist, discovered that the reliques of St. Rosalia at Palermo, which had for ages cured diseases and warded off epidemics, were the bones of a goat, this fact caused not the slightest diminution in their miraculous power."

"Naturally the belief thus sanctioned by successive heads of the Church, infallible in all teachings regarding faith and

¹Loc. cit., pp. 27-28.

²Ibid., p. 30.

morals, created a demand for amulets and charms of all kinds: and under this influence we find a reversion to old pagan fetiches. Nothing, on the whole, stood more constantly in the way of any proper development of medical science than these fetich cures, whose efficacy was based on theological reasoning and sanctioned by ecclesiastical policy."¹ Another almost impassable barrier raised by the Church to balk the efforts of struggling science was the old feeling, inherited from the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans against dissections. The Church, which laid so much emphasis and looked with so much favor on the ascetic attitude which regarded the body as a vile, filthy prison to be weakened or broken in order to free the soul, now that her interest was to defeat science proclaimed the human body to be the beautiful temple of the Holy Spirit to mutilate or destroy which was the greatest sacrilege. This was further reinforced by the teaching in the Apostles' Creed concerning the resurrection of the body. The most ironical excuse offered for her stand against dissection was "the Church abhors the shedding of blood." This, by the Church which gave to the blood-thirsty inquisitor Alva a jewelled sword with the inscription, *Accipe sanctum gladium, munus a Deo*, and which for centuries and centuries caused human blood to flow in torrents! The result of these teachings was that for more than a thousand years surgery was considered dishonorable: "the greatest monarchs were often unable to secure a surgical operation; and it was only in 1406 that a better beginning was made, when the Emperor Wenzel, of Germany, ordered that dishonor should no longer attach to the surgical profession."²

"St. Bernard declared that monks who took medicine were guilty of conduct unbecoming to religion. Even the School of Salerno was held in aversion by multitudes of strict churchmen, since it prescribed rules for diet, thereby indicating a belief that diseases arise from natural causes and not from the malice of the devil; moreover, in the medical schools Hippocrates was studied, and he had especially declared that demoniacal possession is "nowise more divine, nowise more infernal, than any other disease." Hence it was, doubtless, that the Lateran Council, about the beginning of the thirteenth century, forbade physicians,

¹ *Loc. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 30.

² *Loc. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 32.

under pain of exclusion from the Church, to undertake medical treatment without calling in ecclesiastical advice.”¹ Two hundred and fifty years later Pope Pius V not only ordered that “all physicians before administering treatment should call in ‘a physician of the soul,’ ‘on the ground,’ as he declares, that ‘bodily infirmity frequently arises from sin,’ but he ordered that, if at the end of the three days the patient had not made confession to a priest, the medical man should cease his treatment, under pain of being deprived of his right to practice, and of expulsion from the faculty if he were a professor, and that every physician and professor of medicine should make oath that he was strictly fulfilling these conditions.”²

The masses were also prejudiced against physicians and scientists in general because the Church classes them with sorcerers, magicians, and atheists. It will be remembered that Roger Bacon was imprisoned for a number of years, and barely escaped execution, because he was believed to be a magician.

Meanwhile, in order to more successfully combat the advances which medicine was slowly making in spite of the many obstacles thrown in its way, the Church developed a medical science of its own. To this effort we owe such doctrines as “the increase and decrease of the brain with the phases of the moon, the ebb and flow of human vitality with the tides of the ocean, the use of the lungs to fan the heart, the function of the liver as the seat of love, and that of the spleen as the centre of wit.” Also the doctrine of signatures, according to which it is held that God has marked the things which will cure disease. Thus bloodroot, on account of its red juice, is good for the blood; liverwort, having a leaf like the liver, cures diseases of the liver; eyebright, being marked with a spot like an eye, cures diseases of the eyes; celandine, having a yellow juice, cures jaundice; bugloss, resembling a snake’s head, cures snakebite; red flannel, looking like blood, cures blood taints, and therefore rheumatism; bear’s grease, being taken from an animal thickly covered with hair, is recommended to persons fearing baldness.³

“ Still another method evolved by this theological pseudoscience was that of disgusting the demon with the body which he tormented; hence the patient was made to swallow

¹*Loc. cit.*, p. 37.

²*Loc. cit.*, p. 37.

³*Loc. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

or apply to himself various unspeakable ordures, with such medicines as the livers of toads, the blood of frogs and rats, fibres of the hangman's rope, and ointment made from the body of gibbeted criminals. Many of these were survivals of heathen superstitions, but theologic reasoning wrought into them an orthodox significance. As an example of this mixture of heathen with Christian magic, we may cite the following from a mediæval medical book as a salve against 'nocturnal goblin visitors': 'Take hop plant, wormwood, bishopwort, lupine, ashthroat, henbane, harewort, viper's bugloss, heathberry plant, cropleek, garlic, grains of hedge-rife, githrife, and fennel. Put these worts into a vessel, set them under the altar, sing over them the nine masses, boil them in butter and sheep's grease, add much holy salt, strain through a cloth, throw the worts into running water. If any ill-tempting occur to a man, or an elf or goblin night visitors come, smear his body with this salve, and put it on his eyes, and cense him with incense, and sign him frequently with the sign of the cross. His condition will soon be better.' ¹ In surgery, which was until the fifteenth century a despised profession practiced largely by charlatans, "the application of various ordures relieved fractures; the touch of the hangman cured sprains; the breath of a donkey expelled poison; friction with a dead man's tooth cured toothache."² Of the innumerable miracle and fetich cures we have already spoken in another connection.²

"Even such serious matters as fractures, calculi, and difficult parturition, in which modern science has achieved some of its greatest triumphs, were then (Middle Ages) dealt with by relics; and to this hour the *ex votos* hanging at such shrines as those of St. Geneviève at Paris, of St. Antony at Padua, of the Druid image at Chartres, of the Virgin at Einsiedeln and Lourdes, of the fountain at La Salette, are survivals of this same conception of disease and its cure. So, too, with a multitude of sacred pools, streams, and spots of earth. In Ireland, hardly a parish has not had one such sacred centre; in England and Scotland there have been many; and as late as 1805 the eminent Dr. Milner, of the Roman Catholic Church, gave a careful and earnest account of a miraculous cure wrought at a sacred well in Flintshire. In all parts of Europe the pious resort to wells and springs

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 39.

² See pp. 132-134 of this book.

continued long after the close of the Middle Ages, and has not entirely ceased to-day.''¹ These cures have their prototypes in the Old and New Testament, and the priests argued convincingly, "If the Almighty saw fit to raise the dead man who touched the bones of Elisha, why should he not restore to life the patient who touches at Cologne the bones of the Wise Men of the East who followed the star of Nativity? If Naaman was cured by dipping himself in the waters of the Jordan, and so many others by going down into the Pool of Siloam, why should not men still be cured by bathing in pools which men equally holy with Elisha have consecrated? If one sick man was restored by touching the garments of St. Paul, why should not another sick man be restored by touching the seamless coat of Christ at Treves, or the winding sheet of Christ at Besançon? And out of all these inquiries came inevitably that question whose logical answer was especially injurious to the development of medical science: Why should men seek to build up scientific medicine and surgery, when relics, pilgrimages and sacred observances, according to one overwhelming mass of concurrent testimony, have cured and are curing hosts of sick folk in all parts of Europe?''²

Another factor which told against the development of medical science was the strong Judophobia prevalent in the Middle Ages and even later. The Jews were beyond a doubt the best physicians; they studied medicine together with the Arabians in the Dark Ages, brought it into Europe, and were, at this time, the recognized leaders in the profession, but to allow men "who openly rejected the means of salvation, and whose souls were undeniably lost" to heal them would be to insult Providence. "Preaching friars denounced them from the pulpit, and the rulers in State and Church, while frequently secretly consulting them, openly proscribed them.³ . . . "Gregory of Tours tells us of an arch-deacon who, having been partially cured of disease of the eyes by St. Martin sought further aid from a Jewish physician, with the result that neither the saint nor the Jew could help him afterward. Popes Eugene IV, Nicholas V, and Calixtus III, especially forbade Christians to employ them. The Trullaneean Council in the eighth century, the Councils of Beziers and Alby in the thirteenth; the Councils of Avignon and Salamanca in the fourteenth; the Synod of Bramberg

¹*Ibid.*, p. 42.

²*Ibid.*, p. 43.

³*Ibid.*, p. 44.

and the Bishop of Passau in the fifteenth; the Council of Avignon in the sixteenth, with many others expressly forbade the faithful to call Jewish physicians or surgeons; such great preachers as John Greiler and as John Herolt thundered from the pulpit against them and all who consulted them. As late as the middle of the seventeenth century, when the City Council of Hall, in Wurtenberg gave some privileges to a Jewish physician on account of his admirable experience and skill, "the clergy of the city joined in a protest, declaring that 'it were better to die with Christ than to be cured by a Jew doctor aided by the devil.' Still in their extremity, bishops, cardinals, kings, and even popes, insisted on calling in physicians of the hated race."¹

In this field, as in Symbolism and Bibliolatry, the Reformation, especially in its earlier days, effected no marked improvement. Luther himself ascribed his diseases to "devils' spells," declared that "Satan produces maladies which afflict mankind, for he is the prince of death," that "he poisons the air," and that "no malady comes from God."² Protestant ministers in general following Catholic priests cited numerous passages in the Gospels in support of this sacred theory. Chief among these passages is the fifth chapter of St. James:

"Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up."³

The Waldenses, Albigenses and Moravians of the Middle Ages strongly believed in the beneficent effects of prayer, and among the Huguenots we find miraculous gifts of healing and spiritual prophesy. Likewise among the 'Friends' or Quakers of England these gifts obtained, and their leader, Geo. Fox, is said to have wrought many cures. In his journal we read that he wrought many miracles by the power of God; that he made the lame whole and restored the diseased, that he spoke to a sick man in Maryland and raised him up by the Lord's power.

Wesley firmly believed in Divine intervention in human affairs, and his journals teem with ghost-stories, second-sight phenomena, and miracles that had taken place among his disciples.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, p. 45.

³ See Feilding: *Faith-Healing and 'Christian Science'*, p. 29.

⁴ See Feilding: *loc. cit.*, p. 31.

Even in our own day many Catholics in France and Germany make pilgrimages to certain famous shrines such as the Pyrenean Lourdes, the Grottoes of Brive, Rocanadour, Le Puy, Treves, and Kevalaer in the hope of being cured.¹

The most popular of all theological cures was the royal touch for diseases, particularly epilepsy and scrofula, the latter being known as the king's evil.

"This mode of cure began, so far as history throws light upon it, with Edward the Confessor in the eleventh century, and came down from reign to reign, passing from the Catholic saint to Protestant debauchers upon the English throne, with ever increasing miraculous efficacy."²

There is an over-abundance of supposed evidence, both medical and theological, to prove that these cures were effective. Charles II, "the most thoroughly cynical debauchee who ever sat on the English throne before the advent of George IV," touched nearly one hundred thousand persons in the twenty-five years of his kingship, and Louis XIV, on a certain Easter Sunday touched about sixteen hundred at Versailles. The touch of a seventh son and especially of a seventh son of a seventh son was also believed to have great curative power.

In modern times the science of medicine has had to withstand a bitter warfare waged against it by theology on account of its discovery and practice of inoculation, vaccination, and use of anæsthetics.

When Boyer, a little more than a century and a half ago, presented inoculation as a preventive of smallpox, sermons were immediately preached and pamphlets published against *The Dangerous and Sinful Practice of Inoculation*.³ The practice was denounced as "diabolical," "flying in the face of Providence," and "endeavoring to baffle a Divine judgment." In our country it was held that smallpox is "a judgment of God on the sins of the people," and that "to avert it is but to provoke Him more;" that inoculation is "an encroachment on the prerogatives of Jehovah, whose right it is to wound and smite." The words of Hosea: "He hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up," were used as an irrefutable argument against the practice.

¹ See Feilding: *loc. cit.*, pp. 22-23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 46.

³ This was the title of a published sermon by Rev. Edward Massey, 1772.

The same arguments were used against vaccination. "In 1798 an Anti-vaccination Society was formed by physicians and clergymen, who called on the people of Boston to suppress vaccination, as bidding defiance to Heaven itself, even to the will of God ; and declared that "the law of God prohibits the practice."¹

As late as 1885, when small-pox broke out with great virulence in Montreal, the Catholic inhabitants of the city refused to be vaccinated, and as a consequence large numbers of them succumbed to the disease. When an effort was made by the authorities to enforce compulsory vaccination "large numbers of the Catholic working population resisted and even threatened bloodshed. . . . The Abbé Filiatral, priest of St. James's Church declared in a sermon that, "if we are afflicted with smallpox, it is because we had a carnival last winter, feasting the flesh which has offended the Lord ; . . . it is to punish our pride that God has sent us smallpox." The clerical press went so far as to exhort its readers to resort to arms rather than to submit to vaccination. Finally, however, the laws were enforced and the plague stayed. Similar charges were brought against the use of cocaine, quinine, chloroform and anaesthetics in general. Each drug has its own sad story of severe struggle for survival, and in each case the bitterest foe was theology. Likewise the oft recurrent plagues and pestilences which swept away countless millions of human beings all over Europe, threatening at times the annihilation of whole nations, were regarded as expressions of Divine wrath or Satanic malice, instead of the results of unhygienic and extremely filthy modes of living, which of course, they really were, and upon which the Roman Church looked with a great deal of favor. They endeavored, therefore, to stay the plagues not by sanitary measures, but by prayers, fastings, flagellations, sacrifices, penitential processions, and the like. At times they went so far as to offer sacrifices to the ancient Roman gods, whom they considered devils, in the hope of propitiating them.

Because the Jews, on account of their strict observance of hygiene and sanitary laws suffered much less than the Christians, they were regarded by the latter as emissaries in the employ of Satan, hence their mysterious immunity. "As a result of this mode of thought, attempts were made in all

¹ Feilding: *loc. cit.*, p. 58.

parts of Europe to propitiate the Almighty, to thwart Satan, and to stop the plague by torturing and murdering the Jews. Through Europe during great pestilences we hear of extensive burnings of this devoted people. In Bavaria, at the time of the Black Death, it is computed that twelve thousand Jews thus perished; in the small town of Erfurt the number is said to have been three thousand; in Strassburg, the Rue Brûlée remains a monument to the two thousand Jews burned there for poisoning the wells and causing the plague of 1348; at the royal castle of Chinon, near Tours, an immense trench was dug, filled with blazing wood, and in a single day one hundred and sixty Jews were burned.' ' These persecutions were prosecuted throughout Europe with such religious zeal that there is scarcely a foot of its soil that is not saturated with Jewish blood. But the Jews were not the only victims of this terrible delusion. There were also the so-called witches, whom the pious were from the earliest times commanded not to suffer to live.

We need not here dwell on the history of witchcraft and the cruel and ingenious tortures to which the thousands upon thousands of innocent victims, especially aged women, were subjected. These records written in blood by the insane religionists of all nations and ages are well known.

Medicine was not the only branch of science that suffered from the bitter attacks of Theology. All the other branches, as Mr. White shows in his scholarly work, have had to pass through the theological baptism of fire and blood. The poet clearly understood the psychology of religious belief or faith when he wrote:

" The alchemist may doubt the shining gold
His crucible pours out,
But faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast
To some dear falsehood,
Hugs it to the last."

But the last day of fanaticism must come sooner or later to every vigorous, progressive race, and when it comes "dear falsehood" gives place to its conqueror Divine Truth. To-day, if theological dogmas are at variance with the facts of science they must change and adapt themselves to the latter or else be eliminated, and not the reverse, as was formerly the case. In the intellectual realm as well as in the physical, the evolutionary law of 'survival of the fittest' holds sway.

There is, however, as we have pointed out before, in every progressive race an unprogressive element which cannot assimilate the new thought nor adapt itself to the new conditions, but which somehow manages to survive and perpetuate itself. From medieval times down to the present there have always been some to believe in these miracle cures and practice them. There stretches an almost unbroken chain from the Catholic saints and English kings to Mrs. Mary M. Baker Glover Patterson Eddy and her disciples.

In 1662 a certain Irish Protestant, Valentine Greatrakes was convinced that he possessed the gift of healing the King's evil, and for a number of years devoted three days in every week to the exercise of his gift, which he looked upon as a gift of God.

Concerning his works the Bishop of Dromore testified as follows from personal knowledge. "I have seen pains strangely fly before his hands till he had chased them out of the body; dimness cleared, and deafness cured by his touch. Twenty persons at several times, in fits of the falling sickness, were in two or three minutes brought to themselves. . . . Running sores of the 'King's evil' were dried up; grievous sores of many months date in a few days healed, cancerous knots dissolved," etc.¹ Limiting himself at first to the cure of scrofula, he little by little extended his practice until finally he undertook to cure all diseases, and met with great success.

In 1727, at Klosterle in Bohemia, a certain Roman Catholic priest, Joseph Gassner, began his faith-healing works and was so successful that tents had to be pitched for the accommodation of the great crowds which flocked to him from Swabia, Tyrol, and even Switzerland. He continued his cures until the arrival of the famous Mesmer who attributed them to what he called 'animal magnetism' and not to divine intervention.²

Another Roman Catholic faith-healer of the early nineteenth century was Prince Alexander of Hohenlohe-Waldenburg-Schillingsfurst, Archbishop and Grand Provost of Grosswardein, Hungary; Abbot of St. Michael's, and titular Bishop of Sardica. "The imposing names and titles of this aristocratic personage," writes Dr. Tuke, "probably had

¹ Feilding: *loc. cit.*, p. 41.

² Feilding: *loc. cit.*, pp. 43.

much to do with his influence."¹ According to the testimony of the ex-King of Bavaria, who was himself partially cured of deafness by the princely healer, the latter by a few short prayers, and by invocation of the name of Jesus caused the deaf to hear, the blind to see, and the lame to walk. Among those cured were people of both sexes, all ages, and classes, "from the humblest to a prince of the blood."²

Another eye-witness, Professor Onymus, of the University of Würzburg, tells us of a man of seventy who was cured in a few days, of paralysis of many years standing, also of a man of fifty with "arms and legs utterly paralyzed and face of a corpse-like pallor," who on the prayer of the Prince "was instantly cured, rose to his feet and walked perfectly."³ A student who "had lost for two years the use of his legs," and was perfectly cured, is another case cited by the Professor.²

Mention should be made here of the Mormon sect whose half-mystic, half-impostor founder, Joseph Smith, claimed the gift of healing as well as prophecy and interpretation of tongues, and the same claim was made by his successor, Brigham Young, and other Latter Day Saints. One of the articles of the Mormon faith reads: "We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues," etc. Another queer sect, founded in 1831 by Edward Irving and known as the 'Irvingites,' claimed the possession of similar gifts.

From the above it will be seen that that religious curiosity egregiously misnamed Christian Science, which has grown with wonderful rapidity in recent years, is by no means a modern product, nor a Minerva-like creature of Mrs. Mary M. Baker Glover Patterson Eddy's brain, as she would have us infer from a passage on page one, of her *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*. Neither was it an original discovery of 'Dr.' P. P. Quimby, a famous healer who cured her of her chronic diseases and taught her his doctrines, and who died in 1865, one year before his pupil announced her 'discovery' without acknowledging her indebtedness to him.

Of Christian Science and its doctrines, which are familiar to all, little need be said here. There is no doubt that very

¹ The Influence of the Mind upon the Body, in Feilding, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

² Feilding: *op. cit.*, pp. 45.47.

many cures have been wrought by its disciples, but all such cures may be explained as 'Dr.' Newton explained the cures of his pupil and rival 'Dr.' Bryant. When Dr. J. M. Buckley, speaking to Newton, mentioned Bryant, the former "instantly denounced (Bryant) as an unmitigated fraud, who had no genuine healing power."

Dr. Buckley asked, "if Bryant be an unmitigated fraud, how do you account for his cures?" "Oh! they are caused by the faith of the people," replied Newton, "and the concentration of their minds upon his operations, with the expectation of being cured. None would go to see Bryant unless they had some faith that he might cure them, and when he begins his operations with great positiveness of manner, and they see the crutches he has, and hear the people testify that they have been cured, it produces a tremendous influence upon them; and then he gets them started in the way of exercising, and they do a great many things they thought they could not do; their appetites and spirits revive, and if toning them up can possibly reduce the diseased tendency, many of them will get well."

"Doctor, pardon me," said Dr. Buckley, "is not that a correct account of the manner in which you perform your wonderful works?" "Oh no," was the reply, "the difference between a genuine healer and a quack like Bryant is as wide as the poles."¹

The great rock on which Eddyism and its allied cults, both ancient and modern, have grounded is Bibliolatry, and literal interpretation, with which we have already dealt. Every word of the Bible is interpreted literally, and often arbitrarily when there is need of harmonizing it with the 'Scientist's' crude and peculiar metaphysics. Many Scriptural passages, when taken literally and isolated from their context have, if not directly caused such religious aberrations, at least reinforced them, and rendered their struggle for survival much lighter. Thus Mrs. Eddy writes in her book, which is amazingly full of contradictions and absurd statements, that, "Man is not matter, made up of brains, blood, bones, and other material elements. The Scriptures inform us that man was made in the image and likeness of God. Matter is not that likeness. The reflection of Spirit cannot be so unlike Spirit. Man is spiritual and perfect. . . . Man is the

¹A. Feilding: *Faith Healing and Christian Science*, pp. 58-59.

idea of Divine Principle, not physique. He is the compound idea of God, including all right ideas. . . . Man is incapable of sin, sickness and death, inasmuch as he derives his essence from God, and possesses not a single original, or underived power. Hence the real man cannot depart from holiness. Nor can God, by whom man was evolved, engender the capacity or freedom to sin. A mortal sinner is not God's man, for the offspring of God cannot be evil. Mortals are men's counterfeits. They are the children of the Wicked One, or the one evil, which declares that man begins as a material embryo."¹ Again, "I have found nothing in ancient or modern systems on which to found my own, except the teachings and demonstrations of our great Master, and the lives of the prophets and apostles."²

This severe literalism is further brought out vividly and amusingly in Mr. Hazzard's 'Prayer for a Dyspeptic,' which also shows how large a rôle repetition and suggestion play in these cures. "Holy Reality! We Believe in Thee that Thou art Everywhere present. We really believe it. Blessed Reality, we do not pretend to believe, think we believe, believe that we believe. We believe. Believing that Thou art everywhere present, we believe that Thou art in this patient's stomach, in every fibre, in every cell, in every atom, that Thou art the sole, only reality of that stomach. Heavenly, Holy Reality, we will try not to be such hypocrites and infidels, as every day of our lives to affirm our faith in Thee and then immediately begin to tell how sick we are, forgetting that Thou art everything and that Thou art not sick, and therefore that nothing in this universe was ever sick, is now sick, or can be sick. Forgive us our sins in that we have this day talked about our backaches, and that we have told our neighbors that our food hurts us, that we mentioned to a visitor that there was a lump in our stomach, that we have wasted our valuable time which should have been spent in thy service, in worrying for fear that our stomach would grow worse, in that we have disobeyed Thy blessed law in thinking that some kind of medicine would help us. We know, Father and Mother of us all, that there is no such thing as a really diseased stomach; that the disease is the Carnal Mortal Mind given over to the World, the Flesh, and

¹Science and Health, etc., pp. 471-2. Quoted by Feilding, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

²Science and Health, p. 20.

the Devil ; that the mortal mind is a twist, a distortion, a false attitude, the Harmatia of Thought. Shining and glorious Verity, we recognize the great and splendid Fact that the moment we really believe the Truth, Disease ceases to trouble us ; that the Truth is that there is no Disease in either real Body or Mind ; that in the Mind what seems to be a disease is a False Belief, a parasite, a hateful Excrescence, and that what happens in the Body is the shadow of the Lie in the Soul. Lord, help us to believe that All Evil is Utterly Unreal ; that it is silly to be sick, absurd to be ailing, wicked to be wailing, atheism and denial of God to say, 'I am sick.' Help us to stoutly affirm with our hand in your hand, with our eyes fixed on Thee, that we have no Dyspepsia, that we never had Dyspepsia, that we will never have Dyspepsia, that there is no such thing, that there never was any such thing, that there never will be any such thing, Amen.''¹

Is this religious pathology or mere quackery ? It were certainly unphilosophical to make a sweeping statement ; there are undoubtedly many sincere though deluded 'Scientists,' but in the majority of cases we have no hesitancy in saying that there is a mixture of both religious pathology and quackery with the latter element predominating. Christian Science serves a useful purpose in bringing about some sort of mental stability in the minds of neurotic and hysterical individuals, chiefly women, who could not by any other means be effectively cured. But when it unqualifiedly condemns all modern medical science and art it becomes a public danger, and we cannot but approve the strenuous efforts of the medical faculty to have proper laws passed against it.

In our scientific age Christian Science, Mormonism, Dowerism, Spiritualism, and the thousand and one other 'isms' are as much anomalies and aberrations, and as atavistic and degenerate as were the many strange beliefs and dogmas which we have briefly reviewed, in their own day. Just as we have seen there are in every age hyperconservative individuals who are the enemies of progress, because they cannot without difficulty adapt themselves to the new conditions, so, too, are there fickle, nervous, erratic individuals who seize greedily on anything novel, vague, and mysterious, and with a fervor which does more credit to their credulity than their

¹ Quoted by Feilding: *op. cit.*, Appendix A.

intellects, believe in doctrines because they are absurd, and in direct proportion to their absurdity.

DOUBT.

“The true opposites of belief” writes James, “are doubt and inquiry.” It has become almost an axiom that every belief not grounded on truth carries within itself the germs of its own destruction; and these germs are doubts. If from the wreckage new and better beliefs leading to a better *Weltanschauung* arise, then doubt has served a very useful purpose and was normal, but if, on the contrary, doubt merely destroys and leaves a barren waste, then its work has been most baneful and pathological, for any belief, however absurd it may be, is psychologically better than mere impotent doubt, just as any kind of life, even the most wretched, is biologically superior to death. Belief brings psycho-physical satisfaction, peace and stability; chronic doubt leads to intellectual unrest and finally to insanity. Therefore, while doubt plays a most useful rôle in intellectual development, especially during adolescence; while it spurs the intellect on to free itself from the errors of the past, and extend further and further the boundaries of knowledge, its usefulness ceases as soon as it becomes chronic and merely destructive. In the development of an organism there are always two forces at work, anabolism and katabolism, *i. e.*, a healthy life and growth, but so soon as anabolism ceases entirely, or in part, we have rapid degeneration and decomposition ending in death. So when doubt fails to give birth to new beliefs, when the katabolic or destructive process in it is more active than the anabolic or constructive, there follows an intellectual degeneration which ends in morbid despair, melancholia, and frequently in suicide. Healthy, legitimate doubt is the mother of investigation, investigation begets knowledge, and knowledge means progress. But not so with Pyrrhonistic or universal skepticism. That bears no fruit whatever, not even ignorance. Indeed it is worse than sterile, it is a positive negative; a poison, not an opiate. We can make the distinction between normal and abnormal doubt clearer by illustrations.

1. Replying to a questionnaire sent out by Dr. Burnham a respondent writes: . . . “This belief in a real truth lying somewhere intermediate between the adverse testimony

of different witnesses (to which he arrived after a period of doubting) saved me from a radical skepticism, and, of course, from anything like despair, and even from a 'storm and stress' period. This kind of doubt was rather a constant and steady stimulus to inquiry. The result, therefore, was healthful, in that it incited me to study, and carried me through the iconoclastic period to the reconstructive one that followed. Nor do I think that I was ever led to any real pessimism. I never really doubted that God was good, or that the world was rational, but I had found that men had presumed to dogmatize on a great many subjects which they knew nothing about. I had therefore a kind of misanthropy, but even this form of pessimism tended to yield—as I learned to study men themselves and to see how many-sided is what each calls truth—to a vigorous hatred only of intolerance."¹

Another writes: . . . "Everything was challenged, and everything almost seemed open to doubt; but finally, I reached bed-rock in the following propositions:

"There is such a thing as truth, whether I can ever find it out or not—if the truth were known there would be a best way to live in view of the truth—the wise thing to do is to walk in the light of what truth is known, and constantly to strive for new truth. This was a solid foundation—on this I might build but little, but that little would stand."

A clergyman wrote to Dr. Starbuck, "I always hail doubt as sure to reveal some unexpected truth. As often as I have tried to dodge doubts I have suffered. My real doubts have always come upon me suddenly, and unaccountably, and have been the precursors of fresh discovery."²

The main features of one of the most extreme cases were somewhat as follows: "My correspondent," writes Dr. Burnham, "was educated in the religious environment of a Puritan family. As early as the age of fourteen, probably, his skeptical tendencies began. He felt that God was gone from the world. The emotional stress in his case was very great; he felt himself a sinner in having doubts, and yet found no escape. This condition lasted through his college course. Life seemed empty. The relativity of good and evil undermined the ethical standing ground. A few years of travel did not hinder the contest, that raged with perhaps

¹The Study of Adolescence, *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. 1, p. 184.

²The Psychology of Religion, p. 242.

increased fury. He was possessed with gloomy views of life, of its utter uncertainty, and of the absence of anything in it that could be taken up with whole-hearted courage. For a time there was emotional and ethical pessimism of an extreme sort. Perhaps the first reaction against this state of doubt showed itself in a kind of pantheism resting upon the *beauty* rather than the *order* of nature. Finally, the fixing of more certain religious views came with an objective study of the life of Christ. He adds that the whole fight was made single-handed, and that he was hurt rather than helped by religious instructors.”¹ Even in this severe case the doubts were productive of much good, and cannot, therefore, be considered pathological.

2. There is another type of individuals less bold and active. Like inexperienced or faint-hearted swimmers, as soon as they find themselves in deep water they rush back to *terra firma*. Doubt in their case does not lead to new beliefs, but a return to old ones.

I quote again from Starbuck: “It was during my senior year at college that I first began to feel any troublesome doubts as to the things I had been taught; the influence of study in the natural sciences, and the reading of some of the Huxley controversial articles, were responsible in part for this. However, my religious intensity increased at this time, and it was during this year that a conviction began to form in my mind that it was my duty to become a minister.”²

The following case is from Prof. Leuba’s collection:

Case B. A clergyman converted at 20.

“At the age of twenty I entered a theological seminary and remained there four years. The third year I became a member of a conversational club whose motto was the Hebrew for “We stand united for investigation.” During the course of our studies in rationalistic Biblical criticism, a night was devoted to the discussion on the Fourth Gospel, the author of the essay taking ground against the historical validity of this gospel, regarding it as a sort of philosophical writing on certain phases of Christian teaching. I remember the reader’s last sentence: “The Fourth Gospel is a great epic.” By this essay the floodgates of doubt were opened to me. For three days the wild tide swept and surged past and

¹ The Study of Adolescence, *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. 1, p. 186.

² The Psychology of Religion, p. 242.

around me. I felt I must give up the Gospel of John, and if so, my Christian faith also; and with this the universe would go. . . . I yielded myself to what I conceived to be a Higher Guidance . . . At the close of the period I found myself at one with all things. Peace, that was all. . . . When I looked at myself, I found that I was standing on the old ground, but cherishing a toleration of doubt, and a sincere sympathy with doubters such as I had never known before. . . . I could take the logical standpoint, and could see that the arguments were quite convincing, and yet my inward peace of belief was in no way disturbed.¹

In such cases as these the foundations of religion have been laid so deep in the subconscious soil and cemented so firmly by habit and the emotions that no storming of the intellect, however long and violent, can do them any real damage. Reason is as impotent to make them unbelievers as it is to convert confirmed skeptics and atheists to a belief in theological dogmas.

Prof. Leuba explains this paradox by saying that the Faith-state had supervened, by which he means that an *inner adaptation* had taken place by which "a living sense of relationship" was established, "nay, a union, between the individual and ideal powers."² The strong desire and struggle to believe effects a new relationship between the emotions, the intellect, and the will; a state akin to mysticism in which the subject *feels* an indescribable peace and harmony between his psychical powers. In this new readjustment only those ideas are permitted to enter consciousness for which the emotions and the will have an affinity. Prof. Leuba gives several interesting cases which bring out these facts very clearly.²

Belief is, in other words, more a matter of the basal passional and volitional nature than of the intellect. "*The essence of religion*," writes Prof. Leuba in another place, "*is a striving towards being, and not towards knowing.*"³ We generally believe what we desire to believe, *i. e.*, what will harmonize best with our individual being and help it to develop. "*As a rule,*" writes James, "*we disbelieve all facts and theories for which we have no use.*"⁴ And what those

¹ Psychology of Religious Phenomena, *Am. Jour. Psych.*, Vol. 7, p. 372.

² Faith, *Am. Jour. Religious Psy. and Ed.*, Vol. 1, pp. 65-82.

³ *Am. Jour. Psych.*, Vol. 7, p. 313.

⁴ The Will to Believe, p. 10.

“facts and theories for which we have no use” are, are determined by the individual’s temperament, environment, and early education. Missionaries are so frequently unsuccessful because the people whom they wish to convert, especially the older ones, already have a religion and beliefs which satisfy their needs, and have no use for the religion the missionaries offer them. Like the clergyman just mentioned, they may be able to see that the arguments are convincing without having the inward peace of their beliefs in any way disturbed.

3. Still another class meets with religious doubts for a time, and then bring the conflict to a close by either becoming passive or indifferent to religion, or else hostile to it, in which case they entertain other beliefs. Doubt has weakened or destroyed their religious impulse, but not their peace of mind, not their work instinct.

Carlyle, in his excellent chapter entitled ‘The Everlasting No,’ describes with psychological accuracy the terrible suffering which Teufelsdröckh endured during his doubting period. “Alas, shut out from Hope, in a deeper sense than we yet dream of! For, as he (Teufelsdröckh) wanders wearisomely through this world, he has now lost all tidings of another and higher. Full of religion, or at least of religiosity, as our Friend has since exhibited himself, he hides not that, in those days, he was wholly irreligious: ‘Doubt had darkened into Unbelief,’ says he; ‘shade after shade goes grimly over your soul, till you have the fixed, starless, Tartarean black.’ . . . ‘From suicide a certain afterglow (Nachschein) of Christianity withheld me; perhaps also a certain indolence of character; for was not that a remedy I had at any time within reach? Often, however, was there a question present to me: Should some one now, at the turning of that corner, blow thee suddenly out of space, into the other World, or other No-world, by pistol-shot, how were it? On which ground, too, I have often, in sea-storms and sieged cities and other death scenes, exhibited an imperturbability, which passed, falsely enough, for courage.’”

“So had it lasted,” concludes the Wanderer, “so had it lasted, as in bitter protracted Death-agony, through long years. The heart within me, unvisited by any heavenly dew-drop, was smouldering in sulphurous, slow-consuming fire. Almost since earliest memory I had shed no tear; or once only when I, murmuring half-audibly, recited Faust’s Death-song, that wild *Selig der den er im Siegesglanz findet* (Happy

whom he finds in Battle's splendor), and thought that of this last Friend even I was not forsaken, that Destiny itself could not doom me not to die. Having no hope, neither had I any definite fear, were it of Man or of Devil; nay, I often felt as if it might be solacing, could the Arch-Devil himself, though in Tartarean terrors, but rise to me, that I might tell him a little of my mind. And yet, strangely enough, I lived in a continual, indefinite, pining fear; tremulous, pusillanimous, apprehensive of I knew not what; it seemed as if all things in the Heavens above and the earth beneath would hurt me; as if the Heavens and the Earth were but boundless jaws of a devouring monster, wherein I, palpitating, waited to be devoured.

“Full of such humor, and perhaps the miserablest man in the whole French Capital or Suburbs, was I, one sultry Dog-day, after much perambulation, toiling along the dirty little *Rue Saint Thomas de l'Enfer*, among civic rubbish enough, in a close atmosphere, and over pavements hot as Nebuchadnezzar's Furnace; whereby, doubtless, my spirits were little cheered; when, all at once, there rose a Thought in me, and I asked myself: ‘What *art* thou afraid of? Wherefore, like a coward, dost thou forever pip and whimper, and go cowering and trembling? Despicable biped! what is the sum total of the worst that lies before thee? Death? Well, Death; and say the pangs of Tophet, too, and all that the Devil and Man may, will or can do against thee! Hast thou not a heart, canst thou not suffer whatsoever it be; and, as a Child of Freedom, though outcast, trample Tophet itself under thy feet, while it consumes thee? Let it come, then; I will meet it and defy it!’ And as I so thought, there rushed like a stream of fire over my whole soul; and I shook base Fear away from me forever. I was strong, of unknown strength; a spirit, almost a god. Ever from that time, the temper of my misery was changed; not Fear or whining Sorrow was it, but Indignation and grim, fire-eyed Defiance.

“Thus had the Everlasting No (das ewige Nein) pealed authoritatively through all the recesses of my Being, of my Me; and then was it that my whole Me stood up, in native, God-created majesty, and with emphasis recorded its Protest, such a Protest, the most important transaction in Life, may that same Indignation and Defiance, in a psychological point of view, be fitly called. The Everlasting No had said: ‘Behold,

thou art fatherless, outcast, and the Universe is mine (the Devil's); to which my whole Me now made answer; 'I am not thine, but Free, and forever hate thee!'

"It is from this hour that I incline to date my Spiritual New-birth, or Baphometic Fire-baptism; perhaps I directly thereupon began to be a Man,"¹

John Stuart Mill describes his doubting experience in a somewhat similar strain.²

So far the cases are perfectly normal. The doubting, however strong, issues finally in mental tranquility and poise, optimism and healthy-mindedness. They continued to engage in their various callings and remained useful members of society.

4. But now we come to a class of individuals in whose minds an internecine war is constantly raging. These are sufferers of that dread disease which Hegel calls, "*das unglückliche Bewustsein*"—the unhappy consciousness which is forever at variance with itself. Doubting becomes a mania with them, they doubt everything, even their own existence; it absorbs all their interests, usurps all their activities, and ends, as we have said, in pessimism, despair, melancholia and suicide. While among us, they are not of us, merely sad or cynical onlookers at the game of life and its players. Their world, as one of them described it, is "a humid prison-cell, where hope flits to and fro, like a poor bat, beating in aimless flight the walls with timid wings, striking its little head against the mouldering roof."³

Listen to the morbid Oscar Wilde. "When I think of Religion at all, I feel as if I would like to found an order for those who cannot believe; the Confraternity of the Faithless, one might call it, where, on an altar on which no taper burned, a priest in whose heart peace had no dwelling might celebrate with unblessed bread and a chalice empty of wine."⁴ Such a priest poor Arthur Hugh Clough might have been, for never did so great a soul desire more to believe or suffer more because he had to doubt to the very end.

The cultured French, before the recent Neo-Christian movement, were in this unhappy plight. Instead of enjoying

¹ Sartor Resartus.

² Autobiography, p. 133, and *cf. Ped. Sem.*, Vol. 1, pp. 188-189.

³ Quoted by Leuba: The Neo-Christian Movement, *Am. Jour. of Psych.*, Vol. 5.

⁴ *De Profundis*, N. Y., 1905.

life, they dragged out a miserable existence. Without hope, without a God or an ideal to guide them in their life's journey, and being emotional rather than active and vigorous, they wandered about aimlessly like a child who is lost. "We have no chapel where we can kneel down," cried a journalist piteously, "no more faith to sustain us, no more God to whom we can address our prayer. Our hearts are empty, our souls are without an ideal, and without hope. . . . You who have the good fortune of believing in a Sovereign Ruler, entreat him to reveal himself to us, for we long to suffer and die for a faith."¹ And des Esseintes, the hero of Huysman's novel, "A Rebours," wails, "Alas! Courage fails me and my heart heaves. Oh, Saviour, have pity on the Christian who doubts, on the unbeliever who desires to believe, on the convict of life who must embark alone in the night under a starless firmament."

The last sentence is one of deep psychological significance. For those individuals who have accumulated in their mental chamber many pieces of furniture in the shape of beliefs, religious observances, etc., which time and association have endeared to them and made almost indispensable; doubting, which generally means the removal or destruction of these pieces of furniture, is very distressing and dangerous. It is the Christian or Jew or Mohammedan who once believed, but can do so no longer, that suffers, and not the individuals, be they philosophers or fools, who have never believed or believed but little. Prof. Royee states the point very clearly in the following passage: "Any man may by chance, in his mind, come momentarily to question anything. That is so far a matter of passing association, and involves nothing suspicious. A modern, or for that matter, an ancient thinker may moreover persistently question God's existence. If the thinker is a philosopher, or other theoretical inquirer, such doubts may form part of his general plans, and may so be as healthy in character as any other forms of intellectual considerateness. But if a man's whole inner life, in so far as it is coherent, is built upon a system of plans and of faiths which involve, as part of themselves, the steadfast principle that to doubt God's existence is horrible blasphemy, and if, nevertheless, after a fearful fit of darkness, such a man finds,

¹ Leuba: Neo-Christian Movement. *Am. Jour. of Psych.*, Vol. 5, p. 479.

amidst 'whole floods' of other 'blasphemies,' doubts about God not only suddenly forced upon him, but persistent despite his horror and his struggles, then it is vain for a trained skeptic of another age to pretend an enlightened sympathy, and to say to this agonized, nervous patient: 'Doubt? Why, I have doubted God's existence too.' The ducklings can safely swim, but that does not make their conduct more congruous with the plans and feelings of the hen. The professional doubters may normally doubt. But that does not make doubt less a malady in those who suffer from it, and strive, and cry out, but cannot get free.''¹

"The organized mental life, the plans, insight, and chosen habits of the patient" must be taken into consideration, *i. e.*, in relation to these is doubting normal or abnormal.

"The evil of the present," says another Frenchman, speaking to students, "resides in the abuse of thought, in the spirit of analysis, which he designates by the term intellectualism,—"that perversion of the mind which reduces us to seeking in life only the spectacles of life; and in sentiments only the ideas of sentiments. Intellectualism destroys intuition, that deep, primitive impulse of the soul which is the natural spring of action, and in so doing brings about the dryness of soul and moral inertia of which France is dying."²

Renan and others among Frenchmen, and Prof. James in our own country, have sought to console these unhappy people, and rid them of their dread disease by offering them a new gospel—"The Will to Believe." "Religion," says Renan, "is necessary—as eternal as poetry or love," and elsewhere he writes, "The most logical attitude of the thinker towards religion is: to behave as though religion were true. We must act as though God and the Soul were proven. Religion is one of the numerous hypotheses, such as the waves of ether, or the electric, luminous, caloric, and nervous fluids, nay, the atom itself, which we know to be mere symbols and manners of speech, convenient for the explaining of certain phenomena, but which none the less we maintain. The more we reflect, the more we see the impossibility of proving; but also the *moral necessity* of believing in these great premises: God and the Soul. Let us keep the category of the unknowable. Parallels meet at the Infinite: Science and Reli-

¹ The Case of John Bunyan, *Psych. Rev.*, Vol. 1, p. 150.

² Quoted by Leuba, *Am. Jour. Psych.*, Vol 5.

gion doubtless meet there. And if not, we can say with Goethe : ‘*Wenn Gott betrügt ist wohl betrogen.*’”

Similarly Prof. James maintains the thesis that when intellectually in doubt we may, nay, we must believe in what seems to us the better of two options, provided, of course, that the options are genuine. If you desire to believe, he tells us, do so and cease propounding questions. There are no answers. No one can tell you whether you are right or wrong. Obliterate your doubts, throttle your reason, if need be, and believe! It is the same advice which Tennyson offered in “*The Ancient Sage.*”

“For nothing worthy proving can be proven,
 Nor yet disproven ; wherefore thou be wise,
 Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt,
 And cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith!
 She reels not in the storm of warring words,
 She brightens at the clash of Yes and No,
 She sees the Best that glimmers through the Worst,
 She feels the sun is hid but for a night,
 She spies the summer thro’ the winter bud,
 She tastes the fruit before the blossom falls,
 She hears the lark within the songless egg,
 She finds the fountain where they wailed ‘*Mirage!*’”

But Tennyson, we have seen, was somewhat of a mystic, and even in those years when he was sounding the deepest depths of doubt he still had a deep-seated faith in God and in the “*strong Son of God, Immortal Love.*” The untimely death of his beloved friend was a terrible shock, it made him sceptical and pessimistic, but temperamentally he was religious and optimistic, and, therefore, when time finally healed his wound he found it not difficult to “*cling to faith*” and “*cleave to the sunnier side of doubt.*” But to bid those who are not natively mystical or so strongly religious and optimistic as he was, to believe in spite of their doubts is to bid them to do the impossible. Changing a few words in Coleridge’s Ode to Dejection we can hear them reply to their counsellors :

It were a vain endeavor
 Though we should list’ forever
 To appeals most eloquent ;
 We may not hope from counsels kind to win
The passion and the life whose fountains are within.

To reason with one who is a slave to doubt is as futile as reasoning with a tobacco or liquor fiend. It is not advice they need, but a remedy, something to cure their disease.

They are generally conscious of the fact that their doubts are absurd and abnormal, but are powerless to prevent them. In all cases of fixed ideas or *Zwangsvorstellungen*, under which general term the insanity of doubting and questioning or *Grübelsucht* falls, "there is an almost absolute impotence of the will, not only to control the absurd ideas, but also an irrestrainable tendency to those acts" (to which the ideas lead).¹ "To one whose mind is healthy," writes one of these unfortunates, "thoughts come and go unnoticed; with me they have to be faced, thought about in a peculiar fashion, and then disposed of as finished, and this often when I am utterly wearied and would be at peace; but the call is imperative. This goes on to the hindrance of all natural action. If I were told that the staircase was on fire and I had only a minute to escape, and the thought arose—'Have they sent for fire-engines? Is it probable that the man who has the key is on hand? Is the man a careful sort of person? Will the key be hanging on a peg? Am I thinking rightly? Perhaps they don't lock the depot'—my foot would be lifted to go down; I should be conscious to excitement that I was losing my chance; but I would be unable to stir until all these absurdities were entertained and disposed of. In the most critical moments of my life, when I ought to have been so engrossed as to leave no room for any secondary thoughts, I have been oppressed by the inability to be at peace. And in the most ordinary circumstances it is all the same. Let me instance the other morning I went to walk. The day was biting cold, but I was unable to proceed except by jerks. Once I got arrested, my feet in a muddy pool. One foot was lifted to go, knowing that it was not good to be standing in water, but there I was fast, the cause of detention being the discussing with myself the reasons why I should not stand in that pool."²

There is a prophylactic for this, much more efficient than any philosophical argument or impassioned exhortation, namely, work—interesting and absorbing work. Work by satisfying a deep-seated instinct in us, gives pleasure and satisfaction and withdraws the mind from morbid hair-splittings, barren reflections and contemplations. Satisfying the instinct of workmanship, if it does not create 'the will to live,' certainly

¹See Cowles: *Insistent and Fixed Ideas*, *Amer. Jour. Psych.*, Vol. 1, p. 226.

²James: *Psychology*, Vol. 2, p. 284 footnote.

strengthens it. The muse of idleness is the demon Doubt, and the theme of his dirge is pessimism, despair, death! The doubting mania is probably more a disease of the will than of the intellect, and one of the best means of developing the will is work.

“Produce! Produce!” cries Carlyle in his chapter entitled “The Everlasting Yea.” “Were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a Product, produce it, in God’s name! ‘T is the utmost thou hast in thee: out with it, then. Up, Up! Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might. Work while it is called To-day; for the Night cometh, wherein no man can work.” The same Gospel of Work is preached in Goethe’s *Faust*, and has recently been emphasized from the physiological side by Prof. Jaques Loeb, and from the pedagogical side by Dr. Wm. H. Burnham.

Religious doubts make their first appearance during the ‘storm and stress’ period of adolescence. “Doubt seems to belong to youth” writes Starbuck, “as its natural heritage.” More than two-thirds of his cases and three-fourths of those studied by Dr. Burnham “passed through a period sometime, usually during adolescence, when religious authority and theological doctrines were taken up and seriously questioned.”¹ It is then that the “unconscious cerebration” wells up above the threshold, and the middle layer of tangential fibres, corresponding to Hughling Jackson’s highest level, begin to function. The reasoning faculty rapidly develops, new sensations begin to pour in, the reproductive powers and sex instincts are born, the emotions are heightened; love, altruism, and the social instincts suddenly emerge; in short a new consciousness is born. Former habits of thought and action are found unfit for the changed conditions and are abandoned. Old beliefs are cast into the scales and too frequently found wanting. The child is a child no more. The young savage suddenly becomes poet, philosopher, philanthropist, reformer, with his lofty ideals, gigantic plans, air-castles, his vague yearnings and cravings, and his pleasing moods of melancholy. The brain cells and nerves are charged with vitality up to the danger point. Whether the storm will blow over without causing any damage or not will, of course, depend on the resistance power of the cells and nerves, that is upon the neurological condition,

¹ The Psych. of Religion, p. 232.

and this in its turn will be determined largely by the individual's general health, education, environment, heredity, etc.

Adolescence is the golden age of heredity. Now every link in the chain stretching back for many generations is put to test and if any of them have been abused the adolescent pays the penalty. In this sense he suffers for the sins of his fathers. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that "in some instances," as Maudsley says, "physiological evolution of puberty passes into a pathological revolution." Next to heredity as a predisposing cause of insanity comes education, or rather mal-education, and this we find is also the most common cause of doubt. Early, narrow, religious training followed by the study of science and philosophy, by contact with a new and much less orthodox environment, and by the growth which these factors naturally bring about has blighted the happiness of many an adolescent, and robbed him forever of the blessings of religion. Mr. H. Fielding, in his 'Hearts of Men,' has given an admirable account of his own early religious education and the causes which led him to break with it. He was brought up he tells us until he was twelve entirely by women, and from these he received his moral and religious ideas. At twelve he was sent off to a large boy's school, and there his troubles began. Little by little the great incongruities between the world as he had seen it through his aunts' spectacles, and the world as it really is, between the Christian religion as he had been taught it, "the teaching of Christ, the very simple teaching that is in the Gospel," and the actual concrete Christianity with which he now came in daily contact, the disharmony between the accepted doctrines and professed beliefs and the habitual conduct of those about him, and the world at large, forced themselves upon him and "caused him to shrink from religion and everything pertaining to it." "He found himself at eighteen far adrift from all guidance and counsel, shunning religion because he saw that the teachings of Christ were quite unadapted for the world he had to live in, and condemning his teachers for what seemed to him hypocrisy." His reaction, however, was not yet complete. The aversion he felt towards religion was not as yet well defined, but vague and undifferentiated, so to speak. "About this time he read the 'Origin of Species' and 'The Descent of Man.' This surprised him. It was not only that this was his first introduction to

the science of biology, his first peep behind the curtain of modern forms into the coulisses of the world that interested him, but there was here contained a complete refutation, a disastrous overthrow, of all that system of the Creation which he had been taught. The Old Testament was wrong, the New Testament was wrong. It was all 'an old woman's tale.' At the touch of science the whole fabric of religion fell into dust. Christianity was a fraud, and there was an end of it.' Such biographies and confessions show us better than any metaphysical theories or psychological analysis could, the main cause of religious doubt, its origin, and the course of its development. Taught in early childhood to believe the Bible literally; refused, evaded, and even deceived when innocent and natural questions were asked, given an ethical code, and ideals which though lofty and ennobling to the mature man, are as yet anti-natural and impossible for children and youths, it is little wonder that so many thoughtful and earnest adolescents, when they begin to think for themselves and study the sciences are tortured with doubts, until finally they bolt the whole religion. The clergy and religious pedagogues cannot be reminded too often that not only is it dangerous to the well-being of their charges and to religion to teach the bible literally, but also that the same ideals cannot be preached to old and young alike. Children, adolescents, marriageable young men and women, middle aged persons, and senescents, each need different ideals and sermons. Religious teaching, like secular teaching should be graded to suit the varying needs of the different stages of the individual's development.¹

What evil effects the older religious pedagogical system was productive of can be further seen from the many replies received by Drs. Hall, Leuba, and Starbuck. One respondent writes, "When sixteen I read the doctrine of evolution and 'The Idea of God.' Everything seemed different; I felt as if I had been living all my life on a little island and now was pushed off into a great ocean. I have been splashing around, and hardly know my bearings yet. I don't see any need for a belief in the resurrection."² Another writes, "At fifteen I began to give up the faith of my childhood point by point, as it would not stand the test of

¹ See an excellent article by Jean du Buy: 'Stages of Religious Development,' *Am. Jour. of Religious Psy. and Ed.*, Vol. 1, pp. 7-29.

² Starbuck: *loc cit.*, p. 233.

reason. First the belief in miracles went, then the divinity of Christ; then at eighteen metaphysical studies showed me that I could not prove the existence of a personal God, and left me without a religion."¹ And so on *ad libitum*. There is a passage in the Talmund which reads "Histallek min Ha'sofek," "Keep away from doubt." This has been the policy of all churches, but it is hardly a good pedagogic precept. We should rather face all honest spontaneous doubts and endeavor to overcome them. "A preliminary doubt," says Sir W. Hamilton, "is the fundamental condition of philosophy," and Aristotle declared that "Philosophy is the art of doubting well."

There is as much truth as poetry in Tennyson's lines,

"There lies more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

As also in the following :

"Who never doubted never half believed;
Where doubt there truth is — 't is her shadow."

The child should be so educated that when the doubting period comes his doubts will be of the kind consecrated by Descartes — '*dubito ut intelligam*,' and characterized by Goethe as "the active skepticism whose whole aim is to conquer itself." It is the task and duty of religious pedagogy to devise, along some such line as suggested by Dr. du Buy, a curriculum adapted to the changing needs of the growing child, and harmonizing with our modern civilization, and thus prepare him for the battle before it comes.

SCIENTISM AND APATHY.

Between the believers and skeptics, both of whom are swayed by their emotions and volitions, stand the disbelievers or atheists who hate religion, and the scientists and others who are indifferent to it. The scientist deals with religion in the same impartial, impersonal spirit as he does with the arts and the natural sciences. He is no partisan; he is the champion of no special form of religion, not even the one in which he was reared. Facts and truths are what he seeks, and he cares not in whose domain he finds them. He compares, analyses, and dissects religions, reverently and sympa-

¹ Starbuck: *loc cit.*, p. 237.

thetically, to be sure, but with as little compunction as he would dissect an animal or analyze a chemical compound. He unhesitatingly records his results, and if they disagree with his previous beliefs and notions, the latter are displaced, and he either sees a greater God in the universe, discovers larger and nobler religious truths, or else he goes in the opposite direction and denies the existence of God, becomes skeptic, agnostic, or atheist.

Truth is the Holy Grail which he sets out to find in a truly religious spirit. He is willing to suffer martyrdom for Truth as the religionist is for God.

"It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, Truth is so—"

sings Clough, while Huxley exclaims: 'My only consolation lies in the reflection that, however bad our posterity may become, so far as they hold by the plain rule of not pretending to believe what they have no reason to believe, because it may be to their advantage so to pretend, they will not have reached the lowest depths of immorality. And that delightful, brilliant, Clifford writes: 'Belief is desecrated when given to unproved and unquestioned statements for the solace and private pleasure of the believer. . . . Whoso would deserve well of his fellows in this matter will guard the purity of his belief with a very fanaticism of jealous care, lest at any time it should rest on an unworthy object, and catch a stain which can never be wiped away. . . . If a belief has been accepted on insufficient evidence (even though the belief be true, as Clifford on the same page explains), the pleasure is a stolen one. . . . It is sinful because it is stolen in defiance of our duty to mankind. That duty is to guard ourselves from such beliefs as from a pestilence which may shortly master our own body and then spread to the rest of the town. . . . It is wrong always, everywhere, and for every one, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence.''¹ This is the scientific attitude *par excellence*, and the number of Cloughs, Huxleys, and Cliffords, in this respect, in our midst is almost countless. It will be seen that the true scientist differs but little from the true religionist; truth is the God he worships with genuine religious fervor.

There is another type of individuals belonging to the Paine-

¹ Quoted in James: *The Will to Believe*, pp. 6-7.

Ingersoll-Bradlaugh type who have crossed the Rubicon of Agnosticism and openly express their contempt for the religion in which they were reared, and not infrequently for all religion. Replying to a questionnaire sent out by Prof. Leuba, Case XIV writes: "I do not perform religious exercises, public or private. To me such practices are incomprehensible, childish, and absurd. I have no religious needs. I am devoid of religious feelings. I never had any religious experience. I am very seldom in church. When in one I wonder at the phenomenon of otherwise intelligent persons acting like a lot of heathens. My principal feeling is one of contempt; I also feel ashamed for them for being such monkeys. My physical state at such times is great uneasiness, a feeling of restraint, and an intense desire to get in the open air. Religion, to my conception, is another name for superstition; it is one kind of superstition. I consider it to be utterly useless and superfluous, if not positively harmful. My grandfather was a Presbyterian minister. My mother was a strong Presbyterian. She believed literally. She taught me her faith diligently from my earliest childhood. She was never severe or strict, but taught in a loving and charming way. I attended church and Sunday-school until fourteen. All my early associations tended to make me an orthodox Christian. I have never met a more conscientious person than my mother was. I suppose I accepted her teachings as a matter of course, without reflection when very young. When old enough to study physical geography, I learned that some things she believed were not true. Later in biology, that many more things she believed were not true, and I have been learning ever since what an immense mass of superstition her belief was."¹

The apathist reacts more passively to religion. To him religion is an indifferent matter. He is willing to let religious problems take care of themselves. He cares little whether God does or does not exist. He has very little need of Him. His thoughts and energies are spent on the more immediate practical affairs of life. Thus a Bowdoin student writes in reply to a questionnaire sent out by Dr. Hall. "Concerning a future life I care little; what I want to know is how to make the most of the life I have now; how to be of the most service to the rest of humanity. One life is all I can take

¹ Contents of Religious Consciousness, *Monist*, July, '01.

care of at a time. This 'me' I have got, and before I make any arrangements for another I want to know what I am to do with this.' These thoughts are better expressed by Miss Alice Stead Binney in her poem entitled,

MY CREED.

"I think that many a soul has God within,
 Yet knows no church nor creed, no word of prayer,
 No law of life save that which seems most fair
 And true and just, and helpful to its kin
 And kind ; and holds that act alone as sin
 That lays upon another soul its share
 Of human pain, of sorrow, or of care,
 Or plants a doubt where faith has ever been.
 The heart that seeks with jealous joy the best
 In every other heart it meets, the way
 Has found to make its own condition blessed.
 To love God is to strive through life's short day
 To comfort grief, to give the weary rest,
 To hope and love — that surely is to pray."¹

Case XIII of Leuba's collection writes that she has no craving after unnamable things, no panting heart sighing after the starry heaven. Life with its parental and social duties is enough to fill her heart and mind with solid contentment. "Post-mundane matters will take care of themselves." Continuing, she writes: "I never had any special religious experience that I am aware of. I was born to certain religious observances and beliefs and never troubled myself about the matter at all especially. As I grew older some dogmas were a stumbling block to me, and as I read and became familiar with some truly great writers—Renan for one—I grew more and more skeptical in a way. But I never analyzed my thoughts or dwelt very long on any of these matters. . . . I scratch out Faith because during the last 15 or 20 years I have read so much, seen and learned so much, that I am not sure what amount of faith I may have left in anything. I don't trouble about it; life is really too short to spend in dwelling much upon merely speculative thoughts. I have half a mind to tear all this 'stuff' up."

Nabatov, one of the characters in Tolstoi's 'Resurrection' is described as follows:

"In religious matters he was again a typical peasant, he never thought of metaphysical questions, of the beginning of all beginnings, of life beyond the grave. God was to him just as to Arago, a hypothesis, for which he had no necessity

¹ The New Century, April, 1902.

thus far. It did not at all concern him how life began ; according to Moses or according to Darwin and Darwinism, which looked so important to his comrades, was to him but a play of thoughts, even as the story of creation in six days.

He was not occupied by the question, how the world began, mainly because the question how to live in it the better was always of greater importance to him. Nor did he ever think of future life, carrying in the depth of his soul the firm, calm conviction which he inherited from his ancestors, and which is common to all agriculturists, that nothing ends in either the animal or vegetable kingdom, but is always changed from one form to another, turning into grains, grains into a chicken, a tadpole into a frog, a worm into a butterfly, an acorn into an oak, thus man, too, is not destroyed, he only changes. He believed in this and therefore he faced death boldly and even cheerfully; he firmly bore the sufferings which led to it, but he neither could nor cared to speak about it. He liked to work and was always busy with practical things and he directed his comrades to such practical work.”

There are to-day in Russia a number of sects such as the Stundists, the Molokany, the Staroveri, the Nemoliaki, the Deniers, the Chalopouts, and others who are thoroughly imbued with the rationalistic and pragmatic spirit. They emphasize the importance of good deeds and brotherly love and reject all church dogmas and ceremonies.¹

Others belonging to this indifferent type, Prof. Leuba tells us, “simply conform cold-heartedly to the same religious customs of the circle in which they happen to live, and no one ever knows the truth, not even themselves. On favorable conditions they may wonder at their religious indifference, yet never reach the revolutionary conclusion that religion is for them a mere fiction.”²

These people are not so few and exceptional as many are inclined to think. Their number is large and constantly increasing, and there are many indications that we are passing through a stage of religious indifference similar to that experienced by the citizens of the later Roman Empire.

“They are legion,” says Prof. Leuba, “the men in whose lives God—any kind of God is a ‘quantitie negligible ;’

¹See N. Tsakni: *La Russie Sectaire*, pp. 135-251.

²Contents of Religious Consciousness, *Monist*, July, 1901.

they live without Him satisfied, they die without Him happy.'

One is naturally very loath to stigmatize these people as abnormal. They are often, as Mill says, "the world's brightest ornaments." Many of them have master minds and lofty ideals which guide them in their life's work. They are sometimes more noble and virtuous than the truly religious individual. Like the religionists, they can point with pride to their long list of illustrious and immortal martyrs. Like the religionists, too, they actively engage in all kinds of philanthropic and educational work, and have probably contributed as much to the uplifting of the race; and yet, if it be true that religion is a mental faculty, innate or instinctive as Max Muller maintains; a component element of the contents of consciousness of all peoples (Tylor); if religiosity is a normal and useful state, then we are forced to conclude that they are abnormal, *i. e.*, they are lacking in an essential element which goes to make up the normal man. If, on the contrary, religion, although useful and normal in the past is now rapidly losing its usefulness and becoming an atavism; if it is to be supplanted in the near future by something loftier, and better adapted to the needs of a scientific age, as Guyau, Sergi, and others confidently predict,—and indeed we already see some significant signs of this change in the various Free-religion and Ethical Culture movements in this country and the Neo-Christian movement in France—if these predictions prove true, then the people we are discussing are not abnormal. They are the forerunners, the *Übermenschen* as Nietzsche calls them, whom the masses will follow as quickly as they can. But to which of these two categories they really belong only the future can tell.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VOLITIONAL ELEMENT IN RELIGION.

The Relation of Religion to Conduct.

In the preceding chapters we have attempted to show the rôles played by the emotions and the intellect in the total religious experience. Here we shall endeavor to indicate the influence of the will on the same, or in other words the relation of religion to conduct. It will be remembered that a group of scholars, such as Feuerbach, Bradley, Marshall, and others have defined religion in terms of will. Their definitions, while inadequate, are useful as complements and correctives to the other definitions which emphasize the emotions or the intellect. They remind us that emotions and beliefs are of little consequence unless they lead to action of some sort and influence the life and conduct of the individual. In the words of Joad in Racine's "Athalie," "*La foi qui n'agit point, est-ce une foi sincere?*" As has often been said before, the bond between the feelings, the intellect, and the will are so close that we cannot stimulate any one without producing excitations in the other two.

In barbarous times true religious feeling and belief demanded for its satisfaction sacrifices, horrible mutilations, flagellations, and numerous other indescribable sufferings; in medieval times it produced bloody wars and revolutions, crusades, inquisitions, and reformations; in our own day it is the cause of missionary expeditions to every known corner of the globe, of much of the charitable and educational work carried on every day; and finally, it has always been at the bottom of the thousand and one religious rites and ceremonies performed in every age and land. "The more one searches," writes Fielding Hall, "the more will he be sure that there is only one guide to a man's faith, to his soul, and that is not any book or system he may profess to believe, but the real system that he follows—that is to say that a man's beliefs can be known even to himself from his acts only. For

it is futile to say that a man believes in one thing and does another."¹ According to Kant, religion arose from morals, and in his own mind the two could not be separated or even differentiated.

The religiosity of the sentimentalist is not true religion any more than are the mere beliefs of the philosopher, the dogmas of the theologian, or the acts of the moralist. To be religious one must love and worship his God with all his heart, and soul, and might. He must labor for His greater honor and glory, and be constantly guided in his actions by what he supposes to be his God's will and desire. In a passage of his treatise against the heretics, Calvin makes a fanatical, and what we should now consider an almost savage declaration, which, because of its very forcefulness, illustrates most lucidly what the fervent religious spirit is, or can be, when the occasion demands. It is similar to the one quoted from St. Jerome in the section of the first chapter dealing with Hate. Addressing himself to the "wretches" who wished to allow the heretics to go unpunished, he assures them that such is not the will of God. "It is not without cause," he tells them, "that God has destroyed all the human affections which have effeminated the heart. It is not without cause that he expels the love of the father for his children, the love of brothers and relatives, that he renders husbands immune to the flatteries and cajoleries of their wives; in short, that he strips men, so to speak, of their natures, in order that nothing may chill their zeal. Why does he require such an extreme, unyielding rigor, unless it is to show that one does not do Him the honor which one owes Him unless he prefers His service to every human regard, unless he spare neither parents, blood nor life, and unless he put himself in utter forgetfulness of all humanity whenever it is the question of fighting for His glory." Calvin was, of course, an enthusiast, but this is true in a greater or less degree of almost all religionists. Whatever we may think of some of the questions put until very recently by the Methodist examiners to the young candidate for the ministry, such as, 'Are you willing to be damned for the Lord?' etc., they indicate clearly that religious people regard that kind of religiosity which is unwilling or unable to express itself in deeds, of little worth. And this is as true of our ordinary secular experiences as of our religious ones.

¹ *The Soul of a People*, p. 13.

The medieval knight-errant roamed about with a patch on his eye and a vow in his heart seeking to run a small course with any other knight for the greater love and honor of his lady, and even in these days of intellectual hypertrophy and emotional atrophy the love-sick swain, though much less artistic or fantastic in his manners and methods, is hardly less active in his efforts to win the favor of his fair dulcinea. Even among the lower animals, especially the domesticated ones, this relationship between the feelings and actions is often very beautifully expressed. Indeed so natural and indissoluble is this bond between feeling and action, that we often hear it asked, of what value is love or any feeling for that matter, if it does not lead to action? To which changing somewhat the dictum of St. James we may answer, "love without works is dead."

The relationship between belief and conduct is equally as close. The ancients, believing that their gods delighted in sacrifice, and the greater the sacrifice the more acceptable it was, offered their own children on bloody altars; the Thugs committed murder for the same reason, the Jews put the Gentile nations to the sword, the Christian Church sanctioned the Crusades and Inquisitions, the Thibetan incessantly revolved his praying machine, the Catholic counted his beads, and missionaries to-day go into voluntary exile among savage peoples all because they believe that by so doing they are best worshipping their God. Indeed, if we were to repeat all that has heretofore been written we would not have begun to give a complete account of the relationship between belief and conduct. It is thus seen how inextricably interwoven are the feelings, intellect, and will; that it is only by abstraction that we can separate them, and by the method of *concomitant variation* determine the relative value of each, and the part it plays in the whole experience. In this chapter we shall deal with those religious experiences in which the volitional element predominates.

FANATICISM.

The very word fanaticism suggests immediately psychical abnormality, or frenzy, and excessive religious activity, and this in general is what it really is. It is the product of a strong will and weak or narrow mind, just as religious mysticism is frequently a product of the latter plus strong emo-

tional feeling. The very fact that men devote their whole lives to religion and hold all other human interests and activities in contempt is sufficient proof of their psychical unbalance. The normal, well-rounded, and well-balanced individual has room in his life for human and worldly interests as well as for religion, but the narrow, unbalanced religionist has no place in his life for anything non-religious. We have already seen that this is true of the mystic, we shall now see that it is just as true of the religious fanatic.

“When devoutness is unbalanced,” says James, “one of its vices is called Fanaticism. Fanaticism (when not a mere expression of ecclesiastical ambition) is only loyalty carried to a convulsive extreme. When an intensely loyal and narrow mind is once grasped by the feeling that a certain super-human person is worthy of its exclusive devotion, one of the first things that happens is that it idealizes the devotion itself. To adequately realize the merits of the idol gets to be considered the one great merit of the worshipper; and the sacrifices and servilities by which savage tribesmen have from time immemorial exhibited their faithfulness to chieftans are now outbid in favor of the deity. Vocabularies are exhausted and languages altered in the attempt to praise him enough; death is looked on as a gain if it attract his grateful notice; and the personal attitude of being his devotee becomes what one might almost call a new and exalted kind of professional specialty within the tribe.”¹

Vambéry, quoted by James, describes a dervish whom he met in Persia, “who had solemnly vowed, thirty years before, that he would never employ his organs of speech otherwise but in uttering everlastinglly the name of his favorite, *Ali, Ali*. He thus wished to signify to the world that he was the most devoted partisan of the *Ali*, who had been dead a thousand years. In his own home, speaking with his wife, children, and friends, no other word but ‘*Ali!*’ ever passed his lips. If he wanted food or drink, or anything else, he expressed his wants still, by repeating ‘*Ali!*’ Begging or buying at the bazaar, it was always ‘*Ali!*’ Treated ill or generously, he would still harp on his monotonous ‘*Ali!*’ Latterly his zeal assumed such tremendous proportions that like a madman, he would race the whole day, up and down the streets of the town, throwing his stick high up into the air,

¹ *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 341.

and shriek out all the while, at the top of his voice, 'Ali!'"¹ Ali himself, who has been called the Peter of Islam, sprang up when Mohammed asked of his few followers who would second him in his labors and become his vicegerent and Khalif (successor), and exclaimed: "I, O Apostle of God, will be thy minister. I will knock out the teeth, tear out the eyes, rip up the bellies, and cut off the legs of all who shall dare to oppose thee."²

"An immediate consequence of this condition of mind," continues James, "is jealousy for the deity's honor. How can the devotee show his loyalty better than by sensitiveness in this regard? The slightest affront or neglect must be resented, the deity's enemies must be put to shame. In exceedingly narrow minds and active wills, such a care may become an engrossing preoccupation; and crusades have been preached and massacres instigated for no other reason than to remove a fancied slight upon the God. . . . Theologies representing the gods as mindful of their glory, and churches with imperialistic policies have conspired to fan this temper to a glow, so that intolerance and persecution have come to be vices associated by some of us inseparably with the saintly mind. They are unquestionably its besetting sins. . . . The saintly temper is a moral temper and a moral temper has often to be cruel. It is a partisan temper and that is cruel. Between his own and Jehovah's enemies a David knows no difference; a Catherine of Sienna, panting to stop the warfare among Christians which was the scandal of her epoch, can think of no better method of union among them than a crusade to massacre the Turks; Luther finds no word of protest or regret over the atrocious tortures with which the Anabaptist leaders were put to death; and a Cromwell praises the Lord for delivering his enemies into his hands for 'execution.'"³

This lengthy quotation is a beautiful literary description of fanaticism, but it does not tell us what fanaticism is in itself; that is, it does not explain why the fanatic is oftentimes cruel, for example, and a partisan. A little further on, however, the writer probes deeper into the matter. "In theopathic characters, like those whom we have just considered, the love of God must not be mixed with any other love. Father and

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 341.

² P. DeLacy Johnstone: *Muhammad*, p. 64.

³ *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 342.

mother, sisters, brothers, and friends are felt as interfering distractions; for sensitiveness and narrowness, when they occur together, as they often do, require above all things a simplified world to dwell in. Variety and confusion are too much for their powers of comfortable adaptation. But, whereas your aggressive pietist (fanatic) reaches his unity objectively, by forcibly stamping disorder and divergence out, your retiring pietist (mystic) reaches his subjectively, leaving disorder in the world at large, but making a smaller world in which he dwells himself and from which he eliminates it altogether. Thus, alongside of the church militant with its prisons, dragonades, and inquisition methods, we have the church *fugient*, as one might call it, with its hermitages, monasteries, and sectarian organizations, both churches pursuing the same object—to unify the life, and simplify the spectacle presented to the soul.¹

It is the instinct of self-preservation, then, that makes the fanatic cruel and partisan. He must have uniformity, simplicity, and order; an environment to which he can easily adapt himself, or else perish. "The (normal) religious man," says Murisier, "ordinarily lives a double life, an interior and exterior. He feels and acts, meditates, worships, and attends to his daily work; without experiencing the least difficulty in reconciling these diverse activities. He passes easily from one to the other, or even combines and identifies them."² In other words the normally religious man adapts himself readily to an ever-changing environment. The abnormally religious man, however, the narrow-minded fanatic or mystic, finds himself, under such conditions, confused, uncertain, unhappy, divided and disaggregated, so to speak. Two courses are open to him. He may find mental peace and poise, and union with God by either renouncing himself and engaging in some kind of absorbing work, preferably religious work, or he may renounce the world and find peace and union with God in his own inner self by contemplation and introspection. The former course is pursued by fanatics, or those abnormals who belong to the active, mobile type of individuals; the latter by mystics or those abnormals who belong to the passive, contemplative type.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 348-349.

² *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieuse.*

A certain Pogatzki, cited by Murisier, said that he always saw visions of the devil and never of God, when he was idle or in contemplation, but whenever he was occupied and overcoming obstacles he experienced great joy and peace of mind.

Finney, the revivalist, tells of an acquaintance of his who secluded himself for seventeen days praying to God continuously, as if he would force Him to come to terms, but his efforts were unsuccessful. He then determined to go forth into the world and work for the Kingdom of God, and immediately he felt the Divine Spirit in his soul and experienced a great and unalloyed happiness.

Again, an American Presbyterian minister writes: "I have suffered all the horrors of profound melancholia. Thoughts of blasphemy which I cannot allow myself to repeat, temptations which I dare not mention flitted across my mind without my wishing it and without being able to repress them. My poor soul, powerless against them was their plaything. I often thought I heard Satan speaking to me, mocking and triumphing over me, asking: where is thy God now? These thoughts presented themselves to me so suddenly and with so much force and reality that I could not believe they were born in my mind; without a doubt Satan had received the power to humiliate me. In my anxiety, I often rolled on the floor of my study, passing whole hours there in despair. If it had been possible for me to do so I would have certainly renounced the ministry. But I was obliged to preach, and at the last moment I put myself to preparing my sermon with the feeling that this side of Hell it was not possible to be more unworthy and more wretched than I was. Once I had begun, however, my sermon interested me; I forgot myself in its preparation. Sunday I preached like an apostle and reclaimed my soul from death.¹

In these three cases, typical of a very large class, we have individuals who, unlike the mystics, feel wretched and out of touch with God whenever they seclude themselves and have only their morbid thoughts and uncanny hallucinations for company, but are happy, contented, and reconciled with God as soon as they forget themselves in interesting and absorbing work which dispels their reveries, rests the brain,

¹ Murisier : *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieuse*, pp. 79-82.

and gives the muscles the exercise they so much need. The best kind of work is that which is done for and in a community. The social instinct is so strongly developed in the fanatic that he feels comfortable only when he is in close contact with his fellow men. The minister preached "with the fervor of an apostle" when he stood before his congregation, and even when he was engaged in preparing his sermon the thought of his congregation and the effect of his sermon upon them helped him to forget himself.

In no other field of activity, perhaps, can these needs of the fanatic be so well satisfied as in the religious, and that is the reason why so many individuals belonging to this type are religious leaders. Religion teaches self-sacrifice and brotherly love, offers rewards for suffering, thereby alleviating its pains, and what is of most importance, it uniformizes the beliefs, acts, forms, ceremonies, emotions and sentiments among the different members of a community, thus creating a uniform and stable social environment.

A celebrated passage from Bossuet will serve to partially illustrate this fact.

"How grand is the Roman Church, sustaining all the churches, bearing the burden of all who suffer, *preserving the Unity*. . . . Holy Roman Church, mother of churches and of all the faithful, the Church chosen by God to unite His children in the same faith and love, we will always hold to thy unity, etc."¹ Objective or social unity and permanency are the fanatic's prerequisites for subjective stability.

The truth of this fact is further borne out by the history of the long and bitter warfare of the church against science, or as the churchmen preferred to call it, 'heresy.' Heresy is an unpardonable crime in the eyes of the fanatic. New thought, new changes upset him immediately and render him not unfrequently mentally unbalanced for life. If he does regain his equilibrium it is at the cost of greatest effort. This is the reason he endeavors to exterminate originality, his most dangerous enemy. Heresy, to him, is a gangrene which spreads farther and farther. He must either extirpate it or be killed by it, and instinctively he pursues the former course.

Prof. James has given the name 'neophobia' to this frame of mind. "The baiting of the Jews, the hunting of Albi-

¹ Murisier: *op. cit.*, p. 106.

genses and Waldenses, the stoning of Quakers and ducking of Methodists, the murdering of Mormons, and the massacring of Armenians, express much rather that aboriginal human neophobia, that pugnacity of which we all share the vestiges, and that inborn hatred of the alien and of the eccentric and non-conforming men as aliens, than they express the positive piety of the various perpetrators.”¹

Socrates, Bruno, and the host of other noble martyrs were from this point of view justly put to death. Indeed, this is the defence commonly offered by the Jews for the Crucifixion of Christ.

But it should be remembered that this neophobia and inborn hatred of the alien and eccentric is not at any time equally strong in all individuals. Indeed, there are some who, as we have seen, have what might be called a neomania; who greedily snatch up every new fad and idea, and are ever changing in their religious alliances. Again, there are others, broad and liberal minded, who are neither neophobiacs nor neomaniacs, but who calmly judge men and doctrines at what seems to them, at least, their true value. It is chiefly in fanatics that this neophobia is most strongly developed for reasons which we have already noted.

The Christian Church, like all other organizations whose existence depend on uniformity and obedience, attempted to regulate and uniformatize the conduct of its adherents. A few centuries ago this mania was carried to a ridiculous extreme, and we have such absurdities as “The Beard from the Christian Point of View,” a book written to instruct Christians how to wear their beards. The church has frequently excommunicated those who accepted her teachings but rejected her sacerdotalism and ritualism, and she has just as often been satisfied with a purely formal conformity—with a mere attitude or gesture.²

As an institution the Church is even more dependent on external conformity than acceptance of particular doctrines or dogmas, for no matter what men believe, so long as they outwardly conform to the rules and ceremonies of the Church they help to preserve its social unity and stability. The fanatic, who realizes this more clearly than others, always regards attempts to turn aside from established customs as a revolt against society and against God. Views which seem

¹ Varieties, etc., p. 338.

² Murisier: *op. cit.*, p. 111.

to the ordinary man to be perfectly rational and harmless are offensive to him, if for no other reason than that they introduce newness and diversity in his environment. He becomes a persecutor for the same reason that the mystic becomes an ascetic. "Persecution," writes Murisier, "with its many ways, coarse or refined, plays in the collective life the same rôle that asceticism plays in the individual life. Just as asceticism seeks to exclude from consciousness conflicting tendencies and annoying images, persecution seeks to exclude from society peculiar or private views and discordant whims."¹

A brief sketch of the character and work of John Calvin, one of the great leaders of the Reformation, will serve as a concrete example of fanaticism. Although the son of a moderately wealthy and influential father, and independent at the age of thirteen, he never had the desire to seek those pleasures which are so attractive to a young man in his station of life. On the contrary, during his early years at Paris he was rigorously abstinent in his living and very zealous in his studies. He was a reformer in spirit before he was through with his Latin Grammar, and so out of sympathy with even the innocent frivolities of boyhood that his companions surmised him the "Accusative Case," a very expressive and appropriate sobriquet which fitted him all during his life. He was possessed of a very clear and logical mind that could easily penetrate beneath the surface of things, and like many strong characters, had no patience with stupidity and could not brook difference of opinion.

"A mind," writes Renan, "delicate and free from passion, critical of itself, perceives the weak points in its own armor, and is constrained at times to embrace the views of adversaries. The man, on the other hand, who is passionate and absolute in his opinions, barely identifies his cause with that of God, and proceeds with the audacity which is the natural offspring of this assurance. The world belongs to him, and justly, for the world is only impelled forward by strong minds; but delicacy of thought is denied to him; he never sees the truth in its purity; self-deceived, he dies without attaining to wisdom. . . . The mighty men of the world have been those who have never wavered nor stopped to doubt and reflect, but who have felt a cataleptic certainty

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 126.

that they were right and all opposed to them positively wrong. This severe inflexibility, which is the essential characteristic of the man of action, Calvin possessed in an eminent degree. I do not know that there could be found a more complete type of ambition, a man eager to make his ideas predominate because he believed them to be true. Heedless of riches, titles or honors, unostentatious, modest in his life, apparent humility, everything made subservient to the desire to form others in his own image. There is hardly any one, save Ignatius Loyola, who could dispute the palm with him in these terrible transports; but Loyola added to them Spanish ardor and an enthusiasm of imagination which have a special beauty of their own; he still continued to be an old reader of the *Amadis*, pursuing, after the fashion of worldly chivalry, spiritual chivalry, whilst that Calvin possessed all the sternness of passion, without a spark of enthusiasm. One might say he was a sworn interpreter who arrogated to himself the divine right to define what was Christian or Anti-Christian.¹¹ Such a character must, as M. Renan proceeds to show, of necessity be intolerant, and oftentimes seemingly arrogant. He revolted against the efforts of the Catholic Church to restrict the religious liberties of men, but when he came in power he granted them no greater freedom. "He believed otherwise than the Catholics, but he believed as absolutely as they," and in his proselyting methods he differed very little from them, and nothing, however cruel and atrocious, prevented him from endeavoring to obtain these results.

"That violent zeal which urges the man of conviction to procure the salvation of souls by means of a fierce struggle, and without taking any account of liberty, shines forth through the whole of the correspondence of Calvin. Writing to the regent of England during the minority of Edward VI, he says: "From what I hear Monseigneur, you have two species of Mutineers who have risen against the King and State. One side are fantastical persons who, under the color of the Gospels, would put everything into confusion; on the other hand, are persons stubbornly attached to the superstitions of the Antichrist of Rome. Both together richly deserve to be repressed by the sword which has been committed to you, with the view that they attach themselves not only

¹¹ Leaders of Christian and Anti-Christian Thought, pp. 81-82.

to the king, but also to God, who has placed him in the royal seat, and has committed to you the protection of His people as well as of His Majesty.”¹ He holds up to him for a model, the holy King Josias, whom God extolled for “having abolished and harrowed out everything which served only to nourish superstition,” and warns him against following the example of those kings who, “having overthrown the idolaters, but not having completely eradicated them,” are blamed for “not having levelled the temples and places of foolish devotion.”

In the same intolerant and cruel spirit he wrote to Mme. de Cany concerning some unknown person: “Knowing in part what manner of man he was, could I have had my way I would gladly have seen him rot in the ditch, and his coming delighted me as much as if he had cleft my heart with a dagger. . . . Be assured, Madame, had he not got away so quickly, in the discharge of my duty, it would not have been my fault if he escaped the flames.” In defence of his successful efforts to have Servetus put to death,—one of the blackest crimes in the history of religion,—he wrote a pamphlet entitled, “A defence of the orthodox faith, . . . in which it is proved that heretics may be rightly coerced by the sword.” Three years after the execution of Gruet, he stigmatized him as “the adherent of an infected and worse than diabolical sect . . . belching out execrations that ought to make a man’s hair stand on end; infections stinking enough to poison a whole country, that all people of conscience ought to ask God’s pardon for the blasphemy that has been heaped on his name among them.”²

Of Pighuis, a Papist who had written an elaborate treatise on Free Will and Predestination to which Calvin replied, he says, “Pighuis died a little after my book was published; wherefore, not to insult a dead dog, I applied myself to other lucubrations.” In his controversies with his former friend, Castellio, he is bitter and savage, and even stooped to charge that distinguished scholar with having stolen wood for his fire, which, in truth, he had picked up during the night from the banks of the Rhine. The same intolerant and abusive spirit pervades his controversies with Bolsec, Westphal, Heshusius, and the Favre family. It was absolutely impos-

¹ Leaders of Christian and Anti-Christian Thought, pp. 84-85.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

sible for him to countenance opposition. "Dogs bark at me on all sides," he wrote of his adversaries, for whom he never had a kind word, and never entertained a charitable opinion. In this respect he closely resembled another of the world's greatest fanatics, Mohammed, whose curse against his uncle and foe, Abu Lahab, is interesting in this connection.

"In the name of God, merciful and gracious!
Abu Lahab's two hands shall perish, and he shall perish!
His wealth shall not avail him, nor that which he hath earned;
He shall broil in a fire that flames, and his wife carrying faggots!
—On her neck a cord of palm fibres."¹

In morals he was even more stern and exacting than in purely religious matters. Collaborating with Farel, who after much persuasion had prevailed upon him to settle in Geneva and help him in his religious work, he drew up a Confession of Faith in twenty-one articles, and submitted it to the Council of Two Hundred who ordered it to be printed, and proclaimed in the Cathedral Church of St. Peter's, as binding on the whole body of citizens. Their homes were annually visited by inquisitors who questioned them closely as to their faith, their moral conduct, etc. Ministers were given the power to excommunicate, and all classes were severely rebuked for their petty vices and foibles. In this and in his *Ordinances Ecclesiastiques de l'Eglise* we see his great love for order, unity, consistency, and conservatism. "His whole character and mind were constructive and legislative."

"A marvellous change in the course of a short time was wrought upon the outward aspect of Geneva. A gay and pleasure-loving people, devoted to music and dancing, the evening wine-shop, and card playing, found themselves suddenly arrested in their usual pastimes. Not only were the darker vices of debauchery, which greatly prevailed, punished by severe penalties, but the lighter follies and amusements of society were laid under imperious ban. All holidays were abolished, except Sunday; the innocent gayeties of weddings, and the fashionable caprices of dress, were made subjects of legislation; a bride was not to adorn herself with floating tresses, and her welcome home was not to be noisy with feasting and revelry. The convent bells, which had rung their sweet chimes for ages across the blue waters of the Rhone and become associated with many even-

¹ See P. De Lacy Johnston: *Muhammad*, p. 62.

ing memories of love and song, had been previously destroyed, and cast into cannon.'’ Even the number of dishes for dinner was fixed by law. ‘‘The young people think that I press them too hard,’’ wrote Calvin, ‘‘but if the reins were not held with a strong hand their case would be more pitiable. We must secure their welfare, spite their distaste of it.’’

In light of the above analysis of fanaticism we need hardly point out that Calvin was by these methods securing his own welfare more perhaps, than that of the Genevese. He revolted against Catholicism, but in spirit and method he was always a true Catholic. In Geneva he established a *civitas Dei*, such as Augustine had long before dreamed of, and such as the Roman Church had endeavored to establish. He reconstructed along old lines, and transplanted much Catholicism in Protestant soil.

The following from his friend Beza gives us an idea of his prodigious activity. ‘‘During the week he preached every alternate, and lectured every third day; on Thursday he met with the presbytery, and on Friday attended the ordinary Scripture meeting called the ‘congregation,’ where he had his full share of the duty.’’ Besides this he was engaged in writing his Commentaries, and kept up a very wide correspondence. An active and energetic man, sincere, serious, and God-fearing, he was, like a true fanatic, stern, unsympathetic, dogmatic, intolerant, and cruel. He lived in a troublous and unsettled age, it is true, but any other than a fanatic could have lived in it without causing nearly so much misery and strife.

‘‘An impression of majesty, and yet of sadness, must ever linger around the name of Calvin,’’ writes the Rev. Dr. Tulloch. ‘‘He was great, and we admire him. The world needed him, and we honor him; but we cannot love him. He repels our affections while he extorts our admiration; and while we recognize the worth, and the divine necessity of his life and work, we are thankful to survey them at a distance, and to believe that there are also other modes of divinity governing the world, and advancing the kingdom of righteousness and truth.’’

CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS.

As soon as the religious leader or reformer has succeeded in subjugating or quieting his opponents and has gained a

sufficiently large following, he organizes his forces, unifies and binds them together and to himself by means of a government with its numerous laws, forms and officials. This he must do if he would have the results of his labors endure and increase. Without some form of organization, some creed or ceremony to act as an integrating principle, his followers must soon fall away and his work be forgotten. We have seen that Calvin was early engaged on his *Ordinances Ecclesiastiques de L'Eglise*. Moses drew up the religious and social laws for his people while yet in the wilderness. Mohammed left his disciples and followers the *Quran* or *Koran* which is the basis of their political, social, and domestic institutions, as well as of their religious organizations; the early Christians had their *presbuteroi*, *episkopoi*, *diakonoi*, and other functionaries; Joseph Smith modelled his own church organization after this; Mrs. Eddy and Alexander Dowie likewise have their own churches and ordinances, the *Salvation Army* is thoroughly organized; in a word, every religion has its organization without which it could not long live. Religious institutions like their political analogues are the cohesive forces which hold individuals of like sentiments together. They are social bonds, and as such are perfectly normal and necessary products of the social consciousness. We cannot, with Prof. James, consider them abnormal or necessarily injurious to the religious spirit. Like all things normal they may be overdeveloped and become degenerate, but until then they serve a normal function and satisfy normal needs and desires.

“In critically judging of the value of religious phenomena,” writes Prof. James, “it is important to insist on the distinction between religion as an individual personal function, and religion as an institutional, corporate or tribal product. . . . A survey of history shows us that, as a rule, religious geniuses attract disciples, and produce groups of sympathizers. When these groups get strong enough to ‘organize’ themselves, they become ecclesiastical institutions with corporate ambitions of their own. The spirit of politics and the lust of dogmatic rule are then apt to enter and to contaminate the originally innocent thing; so that when we hear the word ‘religion’ nowadays, we think inevitably of some ‘church’ or other; and to some persons the word ‘church’ suggests so much hypocrisy and tyranny and meanness and tenacity of superstition that in a wholesale undis-

cerning way they glory in saying that they are 'down' on religion altogether. Even we who belong to churches do not exempt other churches than our own from the general condemnation.”¹

A little further on, speaking of Geo. Fox's religious experiences, which he calls 'original,' Prof. James says: “A genuine first-hand religious experience like this is bound to be a heterodoxy to its witnesses, the prophet appearing as a mere lonely madman. If his doctrine prove contagious enough to spread to any others, it becomes a definite and labelled heresy. But if it then still prove contagious enough to triumph over persecution, it becomes itself an orthodoxy; and when a religion has become an orthodoxy, its day of inwardness is over; the spring is dry; the faithful live at second hand exclusively, and stone the prophets in their turn. The new church, in spite of whatever human goodness it may foster, can henceforth be counted as a staunch ally in every attempt to stifle the spontaneous religious spirit, and to stop all later bubblings of the fountain from which in purer days it drew its own supply of inspiration. Unless, indeed, by adopting new movements of the spirit it can make capital out of them and use them for its selfish corporate designs! Of protective action of this political sort, promptly or tardily decided on, the dealings of the Roman ecclesiasticism with many individual saints and prophets yield examples enough for our instruction.”²

This distinction between the personal and institutional religion while necessary for logical clearness is apt to distort the truth when pressed too far. According to our author it would seem that religions are the products of a few gifted individuals who have succeeded in winning a large and permanent following, a theory which has already been refuted by sociology and comparative philology.²

“For ethnology,” writes Dr. Ths. Achelis, following Post, Brinton, and Durkheim, “religion, mythology, law, custom, art, are no inventions of individuals, no products of great personalities, but socio-psychical phenomena in the organic development of the race. In origin and essence, religion is a *social* function, and not something left to the pleasure of the individuals as it seems so to be.”

¹ Varieties, etc., pp. 334-5.

² See Max Müller: *Anthropological Religion*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 337.

"The view of the last century," continues Dr. Achelis, "sought the ultimate source of all mental life in the individual alone, and therefore ascribed all such phenomena as religion, law, custom, state, art, ultimately to personal initiative. This view must be regarded to-day as antiquated, inasmuch as it contradicts experience and is unable to explain the facts. These presuppositions, says the acute Wundt, spring from a conception of reality which transforms the elements of phenomena assumed by metaphysics into the actual starting points of these same phenomena. That isolated individual who is represented as standing at the beginning of every line of social development, is to be found nowhere in experience. Experience shows the union of individuals to be the condition of physical development, and in a still higher degree, an indispensable factor of mental life. Language, customs, religious conceptions,—the nearer we approach to their beginnings the less can we conceive of them as the invention of individuals. They are products in which not only many have had a hand, but which could not come about at all apart from the conditions of a unity which embraced every individual life."¹ "Religion," says Muriel, who has made a careful study of religion both from the individual and social point of view, "becomes a social phenomenon because the human person is relative to a collectivity, a member of a group, and consequently he feels, thinks, and acts under the dominating idea of that group which really integrates itself with all that constitutes him."² That is to say, religion is a product of an individual or individuals who are themselves products of society, and that is the reason why the doctrine of the religious genius "proves contagious enough to triumph over persecutions." Were the doctrine not in harmony with the conscious and sub-conscious thoughts and feelings of the group it would win no adherents and die a speedy death. Only those prophets are stoned whose teachings are not agreeable to the group and therefore not contagious.

"If atheism could make itself acceptable to crowds," says Le Bon, "it would have all the intolerant ardor of a religious sentiment, and in its exterior forms would soon become a cult." But the reason why atheism does not make itself

¹ Ethnology and the Science of Religion, International Quarterly, Dec., 1902.

² *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieuse*, p. 95.

acceptable to crowds is evidently because they are religious and not atheistic.

The distinction between "religion as an individual personal function, and religion as an institutional corporate or tribal product is thus seen to be rather a superficial one, and less important than James would have us believe. We can say with equal truth, that religion is an individual product, and that it is a social product. It depends wholly on our understanding of the two terms.

Man is doubtless more than a mere link in a chain ; a cell in the body, or a drop in the ocean ; he possesses a will and a certain amount of individuality. But his will, if it is to function normally, must be subjected to other wills. The normal man lives in harmony and peace with his environment, and his individuality if it is to be at all fruitful must be legitimate, that is, it must be a product of the environment in which it is born. Man is an individual and a *socius* concomitantly and covariantly, and we cannot say with any certainty *this* is a product of his individuality and *that* a product of his *milieu*. The two are interwoven and inseparable.

It is not true, furthermore, "that the faithful live at second hand exclusively, and stone the prophets in their turn." Strictly speaking there is no second-hand religion any more than there is second-hand life. The healthy religious individual does not rely solely and wholly upon his leader to bring him into the Kingdom of Heaven ; he works out his own salvation, as the data gathered by Drs. Leuba, Starbuck, Coe, Burnham, and others abundantly show. "Religion," says Brinton, "does not begin from any external pressure, no matter how strong this may be. If it has any vitality ; if it is anything more than the barrenest ceremonial, it must start within, from the soul itself. This it did in primordial ages in all tribes of men."¹ Of course the religious consciousness of one may be at a much lower level than that of another, but however much or little he may have, it is his and first hand. As a *socius* he reflects in his own small and imperfect way the religious consciousness of his race and time, and in so doing helps to keep it alive and to develop or degenerate it. In other words, religion is a product of individual and social experiences, and only in

¹ "Religion of Primitive Peoples," p. 40.

abnormal individuals, such as mystics and fanatics, is one or the other of its aspects completely submerged. In the light of this it becomes more clearly evident why organizations and churches "attempt to stifle the spontaneous religious spirit." The individual is a social being, and society, as is well known, is an extremely conservative body. The life of the individuals who compose it depends upon its cohesion and unity. They are therefore justly suspicious of any and every new idea, every new change suggested which has within it the slightest possibility of destroying their social stability, their union, their peace and happiness.

Even if it be true, as Sidis maintains, that "the cultivated, civilized individual is an automaton, a mere puppet," he is so because any other specie 'homo' would be very dangerous to the community. Nor are these individuals in any sense abnormal; they are the very salt of the earth, the individuals without whom the world's work could not be done, and without whom religion and art and science and literature and government and commerce could never be. Their religious experiences are not second-hand and of no account simply because they are not as extravagant and absurd as those which form the material of Prof. James's study.

However much we may admire and revere the religious leaders whose experiences Prof. James has described, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that they were abnormal, call it *sub* or *supernormal*, as you please. An analysis of their religious experiences cannot give us a true picture of religion as it lives and moves and has its being in the hearts and minds of the countless millions of normal, healthy-minded men, and of the two we cannot help believing that the latter is by far the most important, and the truer and more useful.

It is almost absurd to maintain that institutional religion is not as genuine and valuable as the so-called purely individual religion. The two are inseparable. Ecclesiastical institutions, as Spencer indicates, by conserving beliefs, sentiments and rites which were evolved during earlier stages of society, by offering resistance to too rapid change, by producing uniformity thereby conduceing to cohesion, conserve the social aggregate, link the past to the present and perform a most important function for the life of the race. Even the Roman Catholic Church, corrupt as it was, still remained "a highly conservative machinery of social and national exist-

ence." "Intolerable in its unspirituality and oppressiveness," writes Tulloch, "it operated as a vast political and social agency, touching life everywhere, and binding it together in all its relations."¹ But, as has been said before, every function may be abused, and the one of which we are treating is no exception to the rule. The excesses of the Roman Church necessitated the rise of Protestantism, just as centuries before the excesses of the Jewish polity necessitated the rise of Christianity. Institutions are living things which are born, ripen and decay; and from their ruins new and better institutions spring up, which in their turn run through the same course and give rise to still better institutions, and so it shall continue to the end of time. Such is the natural and normal course of events, but unfortunately we find too often in history that institutions have gained such a firm hold on the people that it is for a long time impossible for them to free themselves from their stifling tentacles. Protestantisms arise only after incalculable injury has been done.

Says Murisier, "By the creation of new environments religion is able to favor the diffusion of the most refined moral sentiments, and to become one of the essential factors of progress. But by the maintenance of superannuated beliefs and arbitrary practices, by dogmatism, by insisting that truth is enclosed in certain definite formulas, and finally by the resistance which it offers to all intellectual or moral innovation it becomes a truly formidable cause of stagnation and decay."² We see this decayed state of religion and civilization in ancient Mexico with its more than forty thousand temples and million priests; in Peru where there was one priest for every ten laymen, in Ancient Abyssinia, and in the present priest-ridden Russia. A certain amount of mental fixity or conservatism is, as we have seen absolutely necessary, but our mental furniture, to use the figure of Le Conte again, should not be so firmly screwed to the mental floor as to render it impossible to readjust the furniture without tearing up the whole mental flooring.

Speaking symbolically of religious institutions Carlyle says: "Church clothes are, in our vocabulary, the Forms, the Vesture, under which men have at various periods embodied

¹ Leaders of the Reformation, Edin., 1859. p 169.

² *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieuse*, p. 146.

and represented for themselves the Religious Principle; that is to say, invested the Divine Idea of the World with a sensible, and practically active Body, so that it might dwell among them as a living and life-giving Word. These are unspeakably the most important of all the vestures and garnitures of Human Existence.

“They are first spun and woven, I may say by that Wonder of Wonders, Society; for it is still only when ‘two or three are gathered together’ that Religion, spiritually existent, and indeed indestructible, however latent, in each, first outwardly manifests itself and seeks to be embodied in a visible Communion and Church Militant.” The Church visible is certainly of vital importance and has its place beside the Church invisible. The two are mutually related and interdependent. “As in the human constitution, body and soul are intended to exert a mutual influence, each working healthfully and helpfully upon the other,—the body giving utterance and expression to the soul and carrying out its purposes and desires, and the soul animating the body and informing it with grace and beauty,—so also is the intent in all religion. All form is to the end of spiritual life and vigor, and spiritual life is in order to outward influence and fruitfulness.”¹ But when the form hardens and crushes out the vigor and life of the soul it becomes pathological.

ASCETICISM AND MONASTICISM.

The majority of men are normally two-world creatures, and the relationship they maintain between the two, that is, the extent to which the other world shapes their lives and conduct in this, the relative value they attach to each, marks the degree of their healthy-mindedness. It would not be difficult to range the different types of men along this two-world scale, at one end of which we should have to place the extreme other-worldists, at the other end the sensuous epicureans and charlatans, all of whose thoughts, ambitions, and ideals centre about their bodily selves, and between them, the normal two-worlded men in whose lives both spiritual and material interests are properly blended and controlled. We are here interested, however, only with those individuals who are other-worldly *überhaupt*, and these we may divide into four groups.

¹ Herrick: *Some Heretics of Yesterday.*

1. Those who look at the world through smoked spectacles, as it were, and consequently see everything gray and gloomy. Men about them stubbornly persist in being wicked, and the Evil One is still their supreme master. Conditions, on the whole, are deplorable and discouraging, but these pessimists are not passive and resigned. On the contrary, they are extremely active, and of great courage. They constantly wage war with almost fanatic zeal against the devil and his host of agents, and endeavor to reclaim the world, as far as it is possible, for their God. They are ascetics, perhaps constitutionally, perhaps because of their views of life, and also because their world-rescuing task requires an ascetic life, but they are always citizens of the world, wicked as it is. They are certain that the rule of the Demiurge is only a temporary one, that when the proper time and conditions come, he will be deposed, and God Himself will rule over His people. It is this theocratic state, this kingdom of heaven on earth that they endeavor to realize. In this category we may place the Jewish prophets, the Apostles, the Puritans, many missionaries and revivalists, the old Methodists, and possibly not a few modern ones. However, it should be said that in grouping these classes of men under one category it is by no means intended to imply that they are all equally pessimistic or ascetic, or that they are that and nothing more, but merely that, from the present point of view, they belong more or less to the general type we have attempted to describe. And this statement applies to all cases which shall be used as illustrations.

2. There are those who ignore this world entirely; they simply refuse to look at it or be a part of it. It has no value for them. Relatives, friends, honor, riches, in short all things that normal men hold dear are as nothing to them. They make of this life a mere preparation for death which is to usher them into a new and infinitely better world. But with respect to this latter world they are extremely optimistic, and inasmuch as they live in it constantly in their thoughts; their lives, though other-worldly and abnormal from our point of view, are subjectively serene and happy. It is not surprising, therefore, to read so frequently of monks who spent happy lives in their cells, or rather in the paradeses which their fancy created, and "filled the entire world with their songs of joy," to quote St. Anselm; for they who believed themselves citizens of the world to come could well

afford to ignore all earthly goods and joys. "I desire nothing more," declared Marie Alacoque, to quote only one of the many ascetics and anchorites belonging to this class, "than to be blind and ignorant as regards human affairs, in order perfectly to learn the lesson I so much need, that a good nun must leave all to find God, be ignorant of all else to know Him, forget all else to possess Him, do and suffer all in order to learn to love Him."

3. There are individuals who are pessimistic or indifferent with regard to this life, and indifferent, or at least not optimistic with regard to the hereafter. Both worlds are of small or doubtful value. To this class belong the Cynic and Stoic sects of the decadent Greek and Roman periods, and the Buddhists, who are constantly reminded that, "all is transitory; all is misery; all is void; all is without substance," who dread transmigration, and whose supremest desire is annihilation,—Nirvana. Little wonder that, although they number 300,000,000 they allow themselves to be ruled over by a mere handful of English officials and soldiers, that they are nonchalant and non-resistive.

4. Lastly, there are those who approach and enter the condition known as melancholia. To this class belong the large number of unhappy and pessimistic atheists and agnostics whose earthly lives are canopied o'er with leaden skies and who have no hope whatever of a future life. As one of them expressed it: "The world is a human prison-cell, where hope flits to and fro, like a poor bat, beating in aimless flight the walls with timid wings, striking its little head against the moldering roof." And another: "We have no chapel where we can kneel down, no more faith to sustain us, no more God to whom we can address our prayers. Our hearts are empty, our souls are without an ideal and without hope." The other world is non-existent for them, and this one is unbearable.

Such are the four types of other-worldists or pessimists, and all except the first are, according to our criterion, pathological.

They give rise to two distinct kinds of asceticism: the first to a normal, active asceticism whose idea is to labor for the betterment and salvation of the human race; to transform the world into a city of God; and the others to a passive, subjective, corrosive asceticism which accomplishes nothing good and ends in madness. "What a chasm,"

says Harnack, "divides the silent anchorite of the desert, who for a lifetime has looked no man in the face, from the monk who imposed his commands upon a world."¹

"The ascetic instinct," writes Baring-Gould, "is intimately united to the religious instinct. There is scarcely a religion of ancient or modern times, Protestantism excepted, that does not recognize asceticism as an element of its system. . . . The principle of asceticism is abstinence from lawful pleasures, the subordination of certain faculties to others, and the restraint of certain propensities. . . . Buddha taught his disciples a religion of abstinence. . . . Brahmanism has also its order of ascetics. From the earliest Vaidic age, Hindoo thought turned to self-immolation, and annihilation of the carnal desires. Mohammedanism has its fakirs, subduing the flesh by their austerities, and developing the spirit by their contemplations and prayers. Fasting and self-denial were observances required of the Greeks, who desired initiation into the Mysteries. Abstinence from food, chastity, and hard couches, prepared the neophyte, who broke his fast on the third or fourth day only on consecrated food. The scourge was used before the altars of Artemis, and over the tomb of Pelops.

The Egyptian priests passed their novitiate in the deserts, and when not engaged in their religious functions were supposed to spend their time in caves. They renounced all commerce with the world, and lived in contemplation, temperance, and frugality, and in absolute poverty. . . . The Jews also had their fasts, . . . and on special occasions gave themselves up to prolonged fasts and mortifications. . . .

The races of the new world have also an instinctive regard for self-denial and fasting. . . . The wrath of the gods is appeased, and they are made more disposed to listen to prayer, when man fasts. The Peruvians were wont to fast before sacrificing to the gods, and to bind themselves by vows of chastity and abstinence from nourishing foods. Fasting and mortifications of the flesh were common among the Mexicans. The savages of the American continent fasted to obtain ecstatic relation with their guardian spirits; the Aztecs denied themselves food, tortured themselves with deprivation of sleep, and preserved chastity, in order that they might by suffering purify their consciences. They ate

¹ Harnack: *Monasticism and Confessions of St. Augustine*, p. 12.

but once a day, and refrained from stimulating drinks and strong diet. Fasts lasted for three, four, five, twenty, forty, sixty, and a hundred and sixty days, and even sometimes for four consecutive years. There were fasts for the whole nation, family fasts, and fasts for the individual. Numerous congregations of monks, like the Jewish schools of the prophets and the religious orders of Buddhism, were to be found dotted over the country under vows of perpetual celibacy. Parents dedicated their children to the cloister from infancy . . . There were ascetic orders for old men, and nunneries for widows devoted to the worship of Centeotl among the Totomacs, monastic orders among the Toltecs dedicated to the service of Quetzalcoatl, and others among the Aztecs consecrated to Tezcatlipoca.” This type of asceticism which compels its disciples to scourge and lacerate themselves, which drives them into deserts, marshes, caves, on pillar-tops, into narrow cells, or worse still into the unhealthy ooze of their morbid souls is pathological. On the other hand, that type of asceticism of which we have many examples in early Christianity and later in Western Monasticism and which impels its disciples to enter the maelstrom of life and bids them to bend every energy to purify and permeate it with the true religious spirit, which pulsates with vigorous life, loves work and especially work in behalf of others must be considered normal. It gives birth to great religious leaders and reformers, and plays a large rôle in shaping the course of civilization and moulding the destinies of nations. Ascetics of this type practise renunciation both with a view to spiritual perfection, and in order that they may give their undivided thoughts and energies to the service of God and their fellow beings. Like scientists, philosophers, artists, and philanthropists they sacrifice their lower propensities to higher and more altruistic ideals. But these ascetics, it should be said, constitute the small minority, they are the few elect who draw up rules and govern, they are the religious commanders and generals; the others are the religious soldiers who are ordered to obey blindly and unreasoningly. But unlike the obedience of the military soldier which co-exists with a certain amount of legitimate pride, that of the religious soldier is based upon abject humility.¹ “There are actually two churches in the (Roman Catholic) church;”

¹ See Lecky: *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. 2, pp. 198-199.

writes Sabatier, "the one teaching and governing, the other taught and governed; the one active; the other passive."¹ And the same is true of all religions, more or less.

The origins of asceticism are also many and different:

1. Among primitive peoples its origin was, perhaps, purely accidental. If the struggle for existence was as severe as evolutionists depict it then there must have been many famines which lowered the vitality of the people and reduced them to the trance condition in which they saw visions and dreamed dreams. Once this mystic and rather pleasant condition was experienced, it is conceivable that many individuals, especially those of a neurotic temperament, would endeavor to reproduce it artificially, both for its own sake and for the influence it gave them over their more normal neighbors, for they were soon regarded as magicians, soothsayers, medicine-men, and priests. To this category belong the American Indian medicine-men and priests, the Yogins, the Dervishes, and the Mohammedan Fakirs.

2. Among higher races the pessimistic-ascetic attitude toward life is assumed when the people have drained the cup of pleasure to its dregs; gorged themselves with all the legitimate and illegitimate joys of life, and found to their sorrow and disgust that all is vanity of vanities. Their eyes are now open, and they see how grievously they erred in overestimating the value of this world, and underestimating that of the next. The classic example of this is to be found, of course, in Ecclesiastes. After a long inventory of all his works and possessions and enjoyments, Solomon tells us: "Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do; and, behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun. . . . Therefore I hated life, because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me; for all is vanity and vexation of the spirit." Buddha Gotama came to the same conclusion after somewhat similar experiences. What is true of individuals is largely true of races. It was in the dying days of Egypt, Judea, Greece, and Rome, when their glorious courses had been run and their energies dissipated, when repentant disgust which "deep weariness and sated lust" breed in men and make of life a hell had set in, that the various ascetic sects such as

¹ *Religions of Authority*, p. 18.

the Essenes, Cynics, Stoics, Gnostics, Manicheans, Docetae, Montanists, and others were born and developed. And it was, as we should expect, the most learned and licentious centres of these lands that produced the most numerous ascetics, just as the cultivated cities of France and Germany to-day are breeding centres of pessimism and despair, vices and suicides. Truly, the race is but a pendulum which slowly swings between a smile and a tear. But for the ascetic this world is always a vale of tears, and his duty, according to St. Jerome, is to weep—always weep !

3. Another cause of asceticism among advanced peoples was their dualistic philosophy, which also has been well-nigh universal until quite recent times, as witness the belief in Ormazds and Ahrimans, Irans and Turans, eudaimonai and kakodamonia, gods and devils, in good and evil forces in nature and in man, and the exaggerated difference the various races have discerned between the spiritual and material. The world was considered the work of the Evil One, and all that was material was vile and vicious. It was for this reason that so many ascetics yearned to escape from the world, and to free their souls by fastings and flagellations from the sinful and hated bodies which imprisoned them. "Our wretched and weak human flesh," wrote Brother Giles, "is like the pig, that ever delighteth to wallow and befoul itself in the mud, deeming the mud its greatest delight. Our flesh is the devil's knight; for it resists and fights against all those things that are of God for our salvation." Likewise Origen: "All the evil that reigns in the body is due to the five senses." And A Kempis: "The devil sleepeth not, neither is the flesh yet dead: Therefore cease not to prepare thyself for the battle."

Here we have not a mere indifference, nor an irrational refusal to take this world into consideration; not a light and happy world-flight, but a conscious determination reached by a comparison of this world with the other world, in which comparison this world sorely suffers. It is foul and sinful to the last degree, and the duty of every one is to avoid, no matter how painful the attempt may be, its contaminating touch. To understand the origin of such dualistic philosophy we should have to know much more fully than we do at present the history of the experiences of the various races, the story of their struggle for survival, the nature of their physical and social environments, etc. But once this mor-

bid attitude toward the world is assumed we may expect to find all sorts of morbid phenomena following as natural consequences. One of these, which strangely enough has been overlooked by students of religion is *peccatiphobia*, or the morbid fear of sinning, a fear which plays a large rôle in almost all religions.

The following extract from the Manual of St. John of the Cross, a Spanish mystic and ascetic of the 16th century, gives an excellent portrayal of the ascetic's attitude towards natural human desires, the world in general, and his morbid fear of committing a sin.

“First of all, carefully excite in yourself an habitual affectionate will in all things to imitate Jesus Christ. If anything agreeable offers itself to your senses, yet does not at the same time tend purely to the honor and glory of God, renounce it, and separate yourself from it for the love of Christ, who all his life long had no other taste or wish than to do the will of his Father, whom he called his meat and nourishment. For example, you take satisfaction in hearing of things in which the glory of God bears no part. Deny yourself this satisfaction, mortify your wish to listen. You take pleasure in seeing objects which do not raise your mind to God; refuse yourself this pleasure, and turn away your eyes. The same with conversations and all other things. Act similarly, so far as you are able, with all the operations of the senses, striving to make yourself free from their yokes.”

The radical remedy lies in the mortification of the four great natural passions, joy, hope, fear, and grief. To continue the quotation :

“Let your soul therefore turn always :
“Not to what is most easy, but to what is hardest ;
“Not to what tastes best, but to what is most distasteful ;
“Not to what most pleases, but to what disgusts ;
“Not to matter of consolation, but to matter for desolation rather ;
“Not to rest, but to labor ;
“Not to desire the more, but the less ;
“Not to aspire to what is highest and most precious, but to what is lowest and most contemptible ;
“Not to will anything, but to will nothing ;
“Not to seek the best in everything, but to seek the worst, so that you may enter for the love of Christ into a complete

destitution, a perfect poverty of spirit, and an absolute renunciation of everything in this world.

“Embrace these practices with all the energy of your soul, and you will find in a short time great delights and unspeakable consolations.

“Despise yourself, and wish that others should despise you.

“Speak to your own disadvantage, and desire others to do the same;

“Conceive a low opinion of yourself, and find it good when others hold the same;

“To enjoy the taste of all things, have no taste for anything.

“To know all things, learn to know nothing.

“To possess all things, resolve to possess nothing.

“To be all things, be willing to be nothing.

“To get to where you have no taste for anything, go through whatever experiences you have no taste for.

“To learn to know nothing, go whither you are ignorant.

“To reach what you possess not, go whithersoever you own nothing.

“To be what you are not, experience what you are not.”¹

We should search in vain for a better and clearer exposition of the morbid ascetic's inner consciousness than is afforded by these harsh and curious precepts. They indicate first, his morbidly cruel conception of God, or shall we say that such ascetics worship not a God, but a most malignant demon? Second, they indicate that the ascetic's highest ideal is to become non-human and in-human, *i. e.*, otherworldly. Every human quality and attribute is to be extirpated, so to speak, every human desire quelled, until the ascetic becomes what he was not, and what no normal human being ever was. Third, they indicate that ascetics of this type are extremely selfish, cruel, and even immoral. The salvation of his own soul is the ascetic's all-engrossing thought, and although he macerates himself and suffers untold agony, it is for the purpose of obtaining “great delights and unspeakable consolations,” and to win the favor of his cruel God. To obtain these, every obstacle is to be overcome, every tie broken, and every means, even murder, is

¹ St. Jean de la Croix, *Vie et Oeuvres*, Paris, 1893. Quoted by James: *Varieties of Religious Experiences*, p. 305.

justified. "A saint named Boniface struck dead a man who went about with an ape and a cymbal, because he had (apparently quite unintentionally) disturbed him at his prayers."¹

"To break by his ingratitude the heart of the mother who had borne him," writes Lecky, "to persuade the wife who adored him that it was her duty to separate from him forever, to abandon his children, uncared for and beggars, to the mercy of the world, was regarded by the true hermit as the most acceptable offering he could make to his God. His business was to save his own soul. The serenity of his devotion would be impaired by the discharge of the simplest duties to his family."² The last argument which St. Jerome employs in his frantic effort to persuade Heliodorus to leave his family and become a hermit is, "The enemy (the natural human interests) brandishes a sword to slay me. Shall I think of a mother's tears?"³

Mr. Lecky cites many examples of the cruelty and ingratitude of monks to their parents. The following are a few of them. "St. Poemen and his six brothers had all deserted their mother to cultivate the perfections of an ascetic life. But ingratitude can seldom quench the love of a mother's heart, and the old woman, now bent by infirmities, went alone into the Egyptian desert to see once more the children she had so dearly loved. She caught sight of them as they were about leaving their cell for the church, but they immediately ran back into the cell, and before her tottering steps could reach it, one of her sons rushed forward and flung the door to in her face. She remained outside weeping bitterly. St. Poemen then, coming to the door, but without opening it, said, 'Why do you, who are already stricken with age, pour forth such cries and lamentations?' But she, recognizing the voice of her son, answered, 'It is because I long to see you, my sons. What harm could it do you that I should see you? Am I not your mother? Did I not give you suck? I am now an old and wrinkled woman, and my heart is troubled at the sound of your voices.' The saintly brothers however, refused to open their door. They told their mother that she would see them after death: and the biographer says she at last went away contented with the prospect."⁴

¹ Lecky: *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. 2, p. 133.

² *Ibid.*, p. 133.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 137-8.

“Evagrius, when a hermit in the desert, received after a long interval, letters from his father and mother. He could not bear that the equable tenor of his thoughts should be disturbed by the recollection of those who loved him, so he cast the letters unread into the fire.”¹

St. Simeon Stylites “had been passionately loved by his parents, and, if we may believe his eulogist and biographer, he began his saintly career by breaking the heart of his father who died of grief at his flight. His mother, however, lingered on. Twenty-seven years after his disappearance, at a period when his austerities had made him famous, she heard for the first time where he was, and hastened to visit him. But all her labor was in vain. No woman was admitted within the precincts of his dwelling, and he refused to admit her even to look upon his face. Her entreaties and tears were mingled with words of bitter and eloquent reproach. ‘My son,’ she is represented as having said, ‘Why have you done this? I bore you in my womb, and you have wrung my soul with grief. I gave you milk from my breast, you have filled my eyes with tears. For the kisses I gave you, you have given me the anguish of a broken heart; for all that I have done and suffered for you, you have repaid me with the most bitter wrongs.’ At last the saint sent a message to tell her that she would soon see him. Three days and three nights she had wept and entreated in vain, and now, exhausted with grief and age and privation, she sank feebly to the ground and breathed her last sigh before that inhospitable door. Then for the first time the saint, accompanied by his followers, came out. He shed some pious tears over the corpse of his murdered mother, and offered up a prayer consigning her soul to heaven. Perhaps it was but fancy, perhaps life was not yet wholly extinct, perhaps the story is but the invention of the biographer; but a faint motion—which appears to have been regarded as miraculous—is said to have passed over her prostrate form. Simeon once more commended her soul to heaven, and then, amid the admiring murmurs of his disciples, the saintly matricide returned to his devotions.”

There are further accounts of fathers looking with complacency on the sufferings of their only sons, and even sacrificing them at the commands of the abbots; of mothers

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

deserting their children, and listening with dry eyes to their entreaties, but space does not permit quoting them.

4. The God of these ascetics is manifestly not a benevolent and loving Father, but rather an angry Master, a terrible, though perhaps, a just Hater and Avenger. He rejoices not in the good fortunes of men, but in their misfortunes; not health, comfort, happiness, but their opposites—disease, misery, poverty, and despair,—these gratify Him most. Nothing pleases Him more, according to their belief, than the painful sufferings and martyrdoms of His most loving and innocent children. Self-appreciation, nay even self-respect of the most normal sort is extremely odious to Him. Hegel grievously erred when he declared that man cannot possibly think too highly of himself; on the contrary he cannot possibly think too lowly and meanly of himself. Let him not seek after pleasure-giving things which were created by the Demiurge to lure him to sin, nor after self-expansion and expression; let him not hearken to the command of Nature to be just to himself and live the largest and fullest life possible, but let him rather despise Nature, withdraw from the world and its snares, *i. e.*, everything of any human worth, and seek pain, renounce and abase himself, and crush his will to live, if he would win the favor of God, and merit the blessings of the world to come. For no man, they believed, could enjoy both worlds; he must choose one or the other, and just in proportion as he renounced this would he possess the other. As Margaret Peters, a mad mystic and ascetic of the 19th century, declared: “It gives joy to all the host of heaven when we suffer to the end. . . . The greater the humiliation and shame we undergo, and have to endure from our enemies here below, the more unspeakable our glorification in heaven.”¹

“In hope to merit heaven,” these ascetics
Were (literally) making earth a hell.”

The following are abbreviated accounts of a few such ascetics taken from the first two volumes of Baring-Gould’s “Lives of the Saints” entitled January and February. Countless others equally abnormal can be found in the other volumes of the same work and in the sixty odd volumes of the still incomplete *Acta Sanctorum* which the Bolandist Brothers have been preparing for the last four hundred years.

¹ Baring-Gould: *Freaks of Fanaticism*, p. 15.

ST. MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA.

“Desirous of serving God with his whole heart, he forsook the world in the flower of his age, and spent upwards of sixty years in the deserts, in the exercise of fervent penance and prayer. . . . For seven years together, St. Macarius lived on raw herbs and pulse, and for the three following years contented himself with four or five ounces of bread a day. His watchings were not less surprising. He told Palladius that it had been his great desire to fix his mind on God alone for five days and nights continuously. And when he supposed he was in the proper mood, he closed his cell and stood up and said, ‘Now thou hast angels and archangels, and all the heavenly host in company with thee. Be in heaven, and forget earthly things.’ And so he continued for two nights and days, rapt in heavenly contemplations, but then his hut seemed to flame about him, even the mat on which he stood, and his mind was diverted to earth. ‘But it was as well,’ said he; ‘for I might have fallen into pride.’ The reputation of the monastery of Tabenna under St. Pachomius, drew him to enter it in disguise. St. Pachomius told him he seemed too far advanced in years to begin to practice the austerities undergone by himself and his monks; nevertheless, on his earnest entreaty, he admitted him. Then Lent drew on, and the aged Macarius saw the monks fasting, some two whole days, others five; some standing all night, and sitting at their work during the day. Then he, having soaked some palm leaves, as material for his work, went apart into a corner, and till Easter came he neither ate nor drank, nor sat down, nor bowed his knee, nor lay down, and sustained life on a few raw cabbage leaves which he ate on Sundays; and when he went forth for any need he returned silently to his work, and occupied his hands in plaiting, and his heart in prayer. But when the others saw this, they were astonished, and remonstrated with St. Pachomius, saying, ‘Why hast thou brought this fleshless man here to confound us with his austerities. Send him away, or we will desert this place.’ . . . Macarius, on one occasion, to subdue his flesh, filled two great baskets with sand, and laying them on his shoulders, walked over the hot desert, bowed beneath them. A friend meeting him offered to ease him of his burden, but ‘No,’ said the old hermit, ‘I have to torment my tormentor;’ meaning his body.

One day a gnat stung him in his cell, and he killed it. Then, ashamed that he had allowed himself to be irritated by the petty insect, and to have lost an opportunity of enduring mortification with equanimity, he went to the marshes of Scete, and stayed there six months, suffering greatly from the stings of the insects. When he returned, he was so disfigured by their bites, that he was only recognized by his voice.”¹

ST. SIMEON OF STYLITES.

“He was in the convent about four months, serving all without complaint, and in that time he learned the whole Psalter by heart. But the food which he took with his brethren he gave away secretly to the poor, reserving for himself only food for one day in the seven. But one day, having gone to the well to draw water, he took the rope from the bucket and wound it round his body, from the loins to the neck, and wore it till his flesh was cut into by the rope. One day, some of the brethren found him giving his food to the poor; and when they returned, they complained to the abbot, saying, ‘We cannot abstain like him; he fasts from Lord’s day to Lord’s day, and gives away his food.’ Then the abbot rebuked him, and Simeon answered not. And the abbot being angry, bade strip him, and found the rope round him, sunk into the flesh, and with great trouble it was uncoiled, and the skin came off with it; then the monks took care of him and healed him. . . . A horrible stench, intolerable to the bystanders, exhaled from his body and worms dropped from him whenever he moved, and they filled his bed.² When he was healed, he went out of the monastery and entered a deserted tank, where there was no water, no man knowing. After a few days he was found, and the abbot descended into the tank. Then the blessed Simeon, seeing him, began to entreat, saying: ‘I beg you, servants of God, let me alone one hour, that I may render up my spirit; for yet a little while and it will fail. But my soul is very weary, because I have angered the Lord.’ Finally the abbot brought him back to the monastery by force. ‘After this,’ says Theodoret, ‘he came to the Telanassus, under the peak of the mountain, on which he lived till his death, and

¹ January, p. 30.

² See Lecky: *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. 2, p. 119.

having found a little house, he remained in it shut up for three years. But, eager to advance in virtue, he tried to persuade Blasus, who was archpriest of the villages around, to leave nothing within by him, for forty days and nights, but to close up the door with clay. The priest warned him that to die by one's own act is no virtue, but is a great crime. 'Put by me then, father,' he said, 'ten loaves, and a cruse of water, and if I find my body needs sustenance, I will partake of them.' Then Blasus did so, and at the end of the days Blasus removed the clay, and going in, found the bread and water untouched, and Simeon lying, unable to speak or move. Getting a sponge, he moistened and opened his lips, and then gave him the Holy Eucharist; and strengthened by this immortal food he chewed, little by little, lettuces and succory, and such like. . . . For a whole year he stood upon one leg, the other being covered with hideous ulcers, while his biographer was commissioned to stand by his side, to pick up the worms that fell from his body, and to replace them in the sores, the saint saying to the worm, 'Eat what God has given you.'¹

"The wild Arabs came from their deserts to see the wierd, haggard man in his den. He fled from them as they crowded upon him, not into the wastes of sand, but up a pillar; first up one six cubits, then one twelve cubits, and finally, one of thirty-six. Here he swayed his body in prayer, rapidly bending it in two. A spectator attempted to number these rapid motions, but desisted from weariness when he had counted 1,244. On festivals, from the setting of the sun till its appearance again, he stood all night with his hands uplifted to heaven, neither soothed with sleep, nor conquered by fatigue. He finally died on the pillar. A crowd of prelates followed him to the grave, a brilliant star is said to have shone miraculously over his pillar; the general voice of mankind pronounced him to be the highest model of a Christian saint, and several other anchorites imitated or emulated his penances."²

ST. THEODOSIUS.

. . . "The first lesson St. Theodosius taught his monks was, that the continual remembrance of death is the

¹ Lecky: *op. cit.*, p. 119.

² Lecky: *Hist. of European Morals*, 2, p. 119, and Baring-Gould: *Lives of the Saints*, January, p. 73 ff.

foundation of religious perfection. To impress the thought of death more deeply on their minds, he caused a great sepulchre to be constructed as the common burying place of his monks. When it was complete, half seriously and half in jest, he said: 'The tomb is finished, which of you will be its first inmate?' Then one, Basil, a priest, knelt at his feet, and asked to be the first to celebrate the dedication of the sepulchre. Therefore St. Theodosius ordered all the offices of the dead to be recited for Basil, first for three days, then for nine, and then for forty; and at the close of the forty days he died without sickness or pain, as though going to sleep."¹

ST. STEPHEN OF GRANDMONT.

... "In a wild solitude, amidst rocks and trees, Stephen passed forty-six years in prayer and the practice of such austeries as almost surpassed the strength of a human body. He lived at first on wild herbs and roots. In the second summer he was discovered by certain shepherds who brought him a little coarse bread, which some country people from that time continued to do as long as he lived. He always wore next his skin a hair-cloth with iron plates and hoops studded with sharp spikes, over which his only garment, made of the coarsest stuff, was the same, both in summer and winter. When overcome by sleep, he took a short rest on rough boards, laid in the form of a coffin."²

The hermits belonging to the Benedictine order lived on bread and water four days in the week: on Tuesdays and Thursdays they ate pulse and herbs, which every one dressed in his own cell: on their fast days all their bread was given them by weight. They never used any wine, even though it was the common drink of the country, except for mass, or in sickness: they went barefoot, used disciplines, made many genuflections, struck their breasts, stood with their arms stretched out in prayer, each according to his strength and devotion. After the night office they said the whole psalter before day.³

ST. PETER DAMIANI.

... "He lived shut up in his cell as in a prison, fasted every day, except festivals, and allowed himself no

¹ January, p. 152.

² February, p. 226.

³ February, p. 388.

other subsistence than coarse bread, bran, herbs, and water, and this he never drank fresh, but what he had kept from the day before. He tortured his body with iron girdles, and frequent disciplines to render it more obedient to the spirit. He passed the first three days of every Lent and Advent without taking any kind of nourishment whatsoever; and often for forty days together, lived only on raw herbs and fruits, or on pulse steeped in cold water, without touching so much as bread, or anything that had passed the fire. A mat spread on the floor was his bed.”¹

More interesting, perhaps, than any of these is the autobiography of Henry Suso, a German mystic of the 14th century, from which Prof. James gives a lengthy extract in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*.² In order to bring his body into subjection Suso wore for a long time “a hair shirt and an iron chain, until the blood ran from him, so that he was obliged to leave them off. He secretly caused an undergarment to be made for him; and in the undergarment he had strips of leather fixed, into which a hundred and fifty brass nails, pointed, and filed sharp, were driven, and the points of the nails were always turned towards the flesh. He had this garment made very tight, and so arranged as to go around him and fasten in front, in order that it might fit the closer to his body, and the pointed nails might be driven into his flesh; and it was high enough to reach upwards to his navel. In this he used to sleep at night.

. . . He was so covered with parasitic insects that it often seemed to him as if he were lying upon an ant-hill, from the torture caused by the insects; for if he wished to sleep, or when he had fallen asleep, they vied with one another. (It may be mentioned in this connection that St. Francis of Assisi held it for an honor and a glory to wear these “celestial pearls” (lice) in his habit.) Later on Suso put his hands into two leathern hoops, and fastened one on each side his throat, and made the fastenings so secure that even if his cell had been on fire about him, he could not have helped himself. Thus he continued until his hands and arms had become almost tremulous with the strain, and then he devised something else: two leather gloves; and he caused a brazier to fit them all over with sharp-pointed brass tacks, and he used to put them on at night, in order that if he

¹ February, p. 391.

² Pp. 307-309.

should try while asleep to throw off the hair undergarment, or relieve himself from the gnawings of the vile insects, the tacks might then stick into his body. If ever he sought to help himself with his hands in his sleep, he drove the sharp tacks into his breast, and tore himself, so that his flesh festered. When after many weeks the wounds had healed, he tore himself again and made fresh wounds. Later still, to emulate the sorrows of his crucified Lord, he made himself a cross with thirty protruding iron needles and nails. This he bore on his bare back between his shoulders day and night. The first time that he stretched out this cross upon his back his tender frame was struck with terror at it, and he therefore blunted the sharp nails slightly against a stone. But soon, repenting of this womanly cowardice, he pointed them all again with a file, and placed once more the cross upon him. It made his back, where the bones are, bloody and seared. Whenever he sat down or stood up, it was as if a hedgehog skin were on him. If any one touched him unawares, or pushed against his clothes, it tore him. . . . For twenty-five years he never took a bath, either a water or a sweating bath; and this he did in order to mortify his comfort-seeking body. He practiced for a long time such rigid poverty that he would neither receive nor touch a penny, either with leave or without it. For a considerable time he strove to attain such a high degree of purity that he would neither scratch nor touch any part of his body, save only his hands and feet."

To quote Mr. Lecky again, "There is, perhaps, no phase in the moral history of mankind, of a deeper or more painful interest than this ascetic epidemic. A hideous, sordid, and emaciated maniac, without knowledge, without patriotism, without natural affection, passing his life in a long routine of useless and atrocious self-torture, and quailing before the ghastly phantoms of his delirious brain, had become the ideal of the nations which had known the writings of Plato and Cicero, and the lives of Socrates and Cato. For about two centuries the hideous maceration of the body was regarded as the highest proof of excellence."

5. The fervent love of Christ, the desire to imitate Him, especially the sufferings he bore, and to repay Him as far as possible for His great sacrifice for humanity is another cause of Christian asceticism. It has already been shown that the ardent lover yearns to suffer and make sacrifices for the

object of his affection. And when that object is a God who, on account of His love for sinful man has allowed Himself to suffer great insults and crucifixion, these extremely emotional individuals find it impossible to offer sacrifices great enough to adequately express their love and gratitude. "The self-maceration of ascetics," writes Baring-Gould, "arises from no other cause; the Catholic recluse who imposes austerities upon himself does not suffer; he joys in his penances, because they ease his soul of its inextinguishable love."¹ Add to this Christ's warning: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shall save it," and we have the cause of the very many Greek and Roman Catholic ascetic sects, which have persisted from ancient times to the present.

6. Another cause of asceticism is the belief that the final Day of Judgment is near at hand, a belief which has been entertained by almost every race, even our American Indians, and in every age. The dreams and visions of Daniel which pointed to a near dissolution of the iniquitous world, and a general resurrection thereafter, produced a profound impression upon the Jews, upon John the Baptist, and even upon Jesus himself, who undertook to prepare the people for the advent of the Kingdom of Heaven, which he expected to appear at any moment. This expectation became general and continued for centuries. "Persuaded that the Messiah had come, writes Sabatier, they (the apostles and the first generation of Christians) could not imagine that the world would last long. Without a single exception they awaited from day to day the triumphant return of their Master upon the clouds of heaven. The whole Apocalypse of St. John is built upon this hope. Paul was no exception. Almost to the close of his career he believed that he should see before death this glorious revolution and the resurrection of the dead. Such an absorbing vision filled the believers with ardent enthusiasm, detached them from the earth, took away all anxiety for the future. They lived in a fever of exaltation. The

¹ *Freaks of Fanaticism*, Vol. 2, p. 317.

necessities of common life, like its laws, seemed to them abolished.¹

In an appendix² the same author writes: "No single apostle concerned himself with what we call posterity; no one wrote a line, prepared a liturgy, founded an institution, ecclesiastic or other, for the future. The future was closed to them. They believed themselves to be living in the last days of the world. A great number of things which surprise us in their conduct or their ideas, community of goods, indifference to persecutions and menaces, disdain even of marriage and other earthly blessings, are intelligible in the light of their apocalyptic hopes." And President Hall writes of this period: "In this new dualism the *Jehnseits* was so superior to the *Diesseits* that all the scales of value were reversed, and all the troubles, disorders, and ruinations of the period impelled the soul to fly to, and live by anticipation in its home above. . . . It was really the most natural and inevitable result of a fixed and literal belief in the resurrection and all that it implied. The passionate thirst for martyrdom made it thought by many the very best gift they could render to God and they went far out of their way to provoke it. Men rushed to death with a cheer which to the Romans seemed a blind fanaticism because they could not understand it to be anything but sheer obstinacy that men would refuse to cry 'Lord Cæsar,' or burn a grain of frankincense on the altar."³ In the second century this belief formed the most fundamental tenet of the so-called Montanist heresy. "The Montanists claimed that in them the gifts of the Spirit had revived; they predicted the near return of the Christ, and the last judgment; they consequently proposed to maintain, by a discipline to the last degree rigorous, a clean-cut separation and irreconcilable conflict between the 'family of the saints,' and a corrupt world condemned to imminent destruction."⁴

A little later, during the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, the state of affairs—social, political, and moral—was so irremediably rotten, the culture so hollow and untrue, that earnest and religious men feared the end was near, and hastened to obey the call, "Come out of her, my people, that

¹ Sabatier: *Religions of Authority*, p. 23.

² Appendix 10.

³ *Am. Jour. of Religious Psy. and Ed.*, Vol. 1, p. 43.

⁴ Sabatier: *loc. cit.*, p. 35.

you be not partakers of her sins, that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

The same belief was one of the causes of the reckless Crusades, and at the end of every century there have been visionaries who were convinced that it would be the last, and prepared themselves accordingly. "Where this expectation is a living force" writes Harnack, "life, as usually lived, can no longer maintain an independent value, however conscientiously a man may recognize the calls of duty."

7. Great calamities, such as earthquakes, floods, fires, famines, plagues, etc., are the best agents for creating the ascetic temperament.

The Flagellants, or the Brethren of the Cross, as they sometimes styled themselves, a pathological religious sect born during the terrible Black Death of the 14th century, is a case in point. This sect, consisting at first of members of the lower classes, but soon augmented by nobles, ecclesiastics, learned men and women, and even children, endeavored to do penance for the people in the hope of averting the plague. The movement began in Hungary and later spread all over Europe. Led by prominent men and singers bearing tapers and magnificent banners of velvet and cloth of gold, they marched in well organized processions, robed in sombre garments with red crosses on the breast, back, and cap; their heads covered as far as the eyes, their looks fixed on the ground, and presenting a very sad and mournful spectacle.¹ Schaff gives the following description of their processions and actions: "When they came to towns, the bands marched in regular military order and singing hymns. At the time of the flagellation they selected a square, or churchyard or field. Taking off their shoes and stockings, and forming a circle, they girded themselves with aprons and laid down flat on the ground The leader then stepped over each one, touched them with a whip, and bade them rise. As each was touched they followed their leader and imitated him. Once all on their feet the flagellation began. The brethren went two by two around the whole circle, striking their backs till the blood trickled down from the wounds. The whip consisted of three thongs each with

¹ See Hecker: *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, pp. 34 ff.

four iron teeth. During the flagellations a hymn was sung. After all had gone around the circle, the whole body again fell to the ground, beating upon their breasts. On arising they flagellated themselves a second time.¹

Even now, there are some who consider a national calamity a visitation from God, who has been angered, and needs therefore to be appeased. Again, the many ascetic sects of Russia, counting thirteen millions, mostly peasants, owe their birth to their poverty and wretchedness, and to the tyrannical oppressions and persecutions of the government. When adversity of any kind overwhelms him, man either curses God and spitefully throws all rules and morals to the wind, or he hastens to Him, and with shaved head and in sackcloth and ashes, falls upon the ground and supplicates His mercy. Poor worm of the dust! when we remember his utter helplessness against the forces of nature, and his profound ignorance of their *modi operandi*, we cannot but sympathize with the frantic and irrational means he takes to insure himself against them.

Lastly there have been in every land and age a large number of individuals of a passive temperament who have become ascetics because such a life was most natural and comfortable for them; — in it is their line of least resistance. They cannot possibly adapt themselves to the ordinary humdrum of active life, with its various pleasures and pains for which they have no taste, and are willing to purchase at the cost of great privations, solitude and silence, in which they can satisfy their contemplative tendencies undisturbed, and develop their mental and spiritual faculties at the expense of their physical and social instincts and desires. Ascetics of this type are most numerous in the Orient, where the love of tranquility and meditation is very pronounced, but they are not wanting in the West. However, they are more philosophical than the ordinary religious ascetics.

Such in brief are the varieties of genuine ascetics. What can our estimate of them be, other than that with a few notable exceptions they were all extremely egoistical and anti-social, in that they were concerned only with their own well being and salvation, and spared not a thought for their fellow men, not even for their nearest kith and kin; men of passive and pessimistic temperaments, out of harmony with

¹ Religious Encyclopedia, article, Flagellants.

their environment, possessed of one all-engrossing idea, denizens of another world; in a single word, morbid. The world is surely no better for their having lived or rather existed, for there is nothing in their lives which we can admire to-day, not even their virtue; for they were virtuous because they fled the world and its temptations, and not because they remained in it and overcame them.

“I cannot praise,” said Milton, “a fugitive and cloistered virtue unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world; we bring impurity much rather; that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary. *That* virtue, therefore, which is but a youngling in the contemplation of evil, and knows not the utmost that vice promises to her followers, and rejects it, is but a blank virtue, not a pure.”

We have called these genuine ascetics because however bizarre their actions, however gloomy and morbid their views and beliefs, however unnatural and abnormal their lives, they were at least sincere and serious in all they did and believed, and for that reason, if for no other, they commanded respect and admiration from their contemporaries. But when ascetism became fashionable, so to speak, when a halo of glory and sanctity encircled it; monasticism was born, and hosts of individuals in whom the passion was not deep-seated, who were “without the inward strength for the life, and without the deep spiritual impulse,” but who found in the monasteries an opportunity to lead a life of ease and inactivity, flocked to them, with the result that soon the whole life became degraded. Pride, mental disorders, insanity, self-mutilations, often to the extent of suicide resulted; and sometimes violent reaction to unbridled licentiousness. “Thousands had gone out,” writes Harnack, “and the reputation of sanctity, dissatisfaction with the world, or dislike of work, enticed thousands after them. Of inducements to a monastic life there were many, especially since the establishment of a State Church, when a real or affected enthusiasm no longer led to martyrdom.”

Gibbon states that the monasteries were filled by a crowd of obscure and abject plebeians, who gained in the cloister much more than they had sacrificed in the world. Peasants, slaves, and mechanics might escape from poverty and con-

tempt to a safe and honorable profession, where apparent hardships were mitigated by custom, by popular applause, and by the secret relaxation of discipline.' Further, he writes: "The subjects of Rome, whose persons and fortunes were made responsible for unequal and exorbitant tributes, retired from the oppression of the imperial government; and the pusillanimous youth preferred the penance of a monastic to the dangers of a military life. The affrighted provincials of every rank, who fled before the barbarians, found shelter and subsistence; whole legions were buried in these religious sanctuaries; and the same cause which relieved the distress of individuals, impaired the strength and fortitude of the empire."¹

Likewise, Jerome bewailed the fact that individuals of the lowest classes became monks because they found the life easy and comfortable, and could use it as a convenient cloak to hide their vices and crimes. Many became wandering beggars and quacks selling sham relics to the credulous, and playing on the tender feelings of the sympathetic, somewhat as professional tramps do to-day.

That the conditions were not improved in later times is evident from the many burlesques on the monks, the frequent protest of earnest spirits, and the rigid rules drawn up to regulate and fetter their lascivious lives. A letter from Erasmus to an English bishop is interesting in this connection. "The monastic profession," he writes, "may be honorable in itself. Genuine monks we can respect; but where are they? What monastic character have those we see except the dress and the tonsure? It would be wrong to say that there are no exceptions; but I beseech you—you who are a good pure man—go round the religious houses in your own diocese; how much will you find of Christian piety? The mendicant orders are the worst—they are hated, and they know why; but they will not mend their lives, and think to bear down opposition with insolence and force. Augustine says that there are nowhere better men than in the monasteries, and nowhere worse. What would he say now, if he saw so many of these houses both of men and women little better than brothels? I speak of these places as they exist now among ourselves—Immortal Gods! how

¹ *Decline and Fall*, Vol. 6.

small is the number where you will find Christianity of any kind?"¹

It was unavoidable that the monasteries, harboring so many individuals of loose characters, living an institutional life, which is itself favorable for the development of mental disorders of various kinds, in enforced celibacy, and oftentimes in idleness, should become hotbeds of vice and corruption.

St. Theresa vigorously denounced the life she had seen in the unreformed convents, declaring it to be a "short cut to hell!" "Rather let fathers," she advised, "marry their daughters basely, than allow them to face dangers of ten worlds rolled into one where youth, sensuality and the devil invite and incline them to follow things worldly and of the worldly."²

The very term '*Muliers Subintroductae*' is suggestive of the immoral conditions existing in the monasteries. In the time of St. Cyprian, and even much later, monks kept their mistresses, under various pretexts, in their houses. "Noble ladies, pretending a desire to live a life of continence, abandoned their husbands to live with low-born lovers. Palestine, which soon became the centre of pilgrimages, had become, in the time of St. Gregory of Nyssa, a hotbed of debauchery. . . . The luxury and ambition of the higher prelates, and the passion for amusements of the inferior priests, were bitterly acknowledged. St. Jerome complained that the banquets of the many bishops eclipsed in splendor those of the provincial governors, and the intrigues by which they obtained offices, and the fierce partisanship of their supporters, appear in every page of ecclesiastical history."³

Fanaticism, cruel intolerance, party hatred and violence, narrow bigotry, and even bloody persecution of those who opposed them, these terrible and unchristian vices were seen among monks, even in very early times, and stain the records of Monasticism in its palmiest days. Of the evil effect on the mental health of the inmates, Lecky writes: "A melancholy, leading to desperation, known to theologians under the name of '*acedia*,' was not uncommon in monasteries. The frequent suicides of monks, sometimes to escape the world, sometimes through despair at their inability to quell

¹ Woodhouse: *The Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages*, pp. 240-241.

² Woodhouse: *op. cit.*, p. 238.

³ Lecky: *Hist. of European Morals*, 2, p. 162.

the propensities of the body, sometimes through insanity produced by their mode of life, and by their dread of surrounding demons were noticed by the early Church." Combining incidents from the lives of St. Jerome, St. Mary of Egypt, and St. Hilarion, the same author writes a very eloquent description of their unhappy cell experiences. "In the ghastly gloom of the sepulchre, where, amid mouldering corpses, he took up his abode; in the long hours of the night of penance, when the desert wind sobbed around his lonely cell, and the cries of the wild beasts were borne upon his ear, visible forms of lust or terror appeared to haunt him, and strange dreams were enacted by those who were contending for his soul. An imagination strained to the utmost limit, acting upon a frame attenuated and diseased by macerations, produced bewildering psychological phenomena, paroxysms of conflicting passions, sudden alternations of joy and anguish, which he regarded as manifestly supernatural. Sometimes in the very ecstasy of his devotion, the memory of old scenes would crowd upon his mind. The shady groves and soft voluptuous gardens of his native city would arise, and, kneeling alone upon the burning sand, he seemed to see around him the fair groups of dancing girls, on whose warm, undulating limbs and wanton smiles his youthful eyes had too fondly dwelt. Sometimes his temptation sprang from remembered sounds. The sweet, licentious songs of other days came floating on his ear, and his heart was thrilled with the passions of the past. And then the scene would change. As his lips were murmuring the psalter, his imagination, fired perhaps by the music of some martial psalm, depicted the crowded amphitheatre. The throng, and passion, and mingled cries of eager thousands were present to his mind, and the fierce joy of the gladiators passed through the tumult of his dreams."²

The many anecdotes of the severe struggles of saints, to say nothing of the masses of obscure monks, against their eroticism which was either induced or aggravated by their mode of life, and by their vow of chastity, which meant not moral chastity, but the total suppression of their sexual instincts, are pitiable in the extreme. But they belong more properly to the section on Love.

Let it be understood that a wholesale condemnation is not

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 124-125.

here made against monasticism. The impulses which gave birth to it, like those of asceticism are deep-lying and fundamental in a large class of normal individuals. When properly controlled the ascetic tendency works for righteousness and healthy-mindedness, and we may even go so far as to say that without a certain amount of self-renunciation and self-sacrifice, moral excellence is impossible. The greatest characters in history have all been more or less ascetics, and within the Christian Church such names as Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Savanarola, Anselm, Abelard, Erigena, Roscelin, Duns Scotus, Albertus Magnus, and a host of others are a lasting honor and glory to the system which fostered them, if it did not actually give them birth. It was the monks who fanned the dying embers of civilization during the Dark Ages, who converted the hordes of wild barbarians and taught them to be gentle, who gave a lasting impetus to literature, music, painting, architecture, sculpture, and agriculture, and who dignified labor and made it honorable. Surely the civilized world is indebted to monasticism to an extent which it hardly realizes.

It is not with such monasticism, however, that we have here been concerned, but with that form of it which militated against the welfare of civilization and the race, which looked with bitter scorn and contempt upon that most sacred institution of all, namely marriage, and embittered the sweet relations of domestic life; which took men out of the world, away from their homes and families, and preached to them a gospel fit only for maniacs and the most abject slaves; which made of its disciples "a race of filthy animals," to use Gibbon's phrase, and which bred mental, moral, and physical disease.

Surely no one will deny that such monasticism is, to say the least, pathological and irreligious, as we now understand the term.

With this our study of the pathological aspects of religions ends. It were absurd to entertain the belief that it is complete, flawless and wholly satisfactory, but as a tentative attempt in a new and undeveloped field it may not be without some value and suggestiveness to some future worker.

We shall not burden the reader with a lengthy epilogue, or résumé, or even further generalizations and conclusions. If the central idea of the book and the lesson it teaches is not already clear, then our labor has been in vain and a few

more pages will hardly make it less so. We cannot close, however, without reminding the reader again that we have wandered through religious deserts, swamps, and marshes, through the wards of religious hospitals, and insane asylums, so to speak, where we saw the varieties of religious diseases. Our task did not take us out into the busy world, into happy homes and beautiful houses of worship where the uplifting influence of normal religion is abundantly in evidence. We have catalogued and studied the poisonous weeds; the many beautiful and fragrant flowers and fruits need no searching out.

INDEX.

Abbot, definition of insanity, 14
Achelis, quoted, 228-229
Albath, 163
Alexander, Rev., quoted, 57
d'Alviella, on religion, 7
— on symbols, 132
Anaesthetics, Church leaders opposed to use of, 185
Angels, Swedenborg's description of, 108, 111
Anger, an element in religious experience, 33
Animal worship, 30
Apathy, religious, 207-212
Asceticism, 233
— normal and abnormal, 235-238
— origins of, 238-260
Attis and Cybele, festival of, 30-31
Awakening, The Great, 47-50

Baptismal rites, 138
Barclay, on the Talmud, 154
Baring-Gould, on love and religion, 18
— on mysticism, 71, 76
— on asceticism, 236
— extracts from his "Lives of the Saints," 244-249
Beliefs concerning disease, 177
Belief defined, 175
— normal and abnormal beliefs differentiated, 176
Biart, quoted, 64
Bibliolatry, 141ff
Binney, quoted, 210
Black Death and other plagues and pestilences, 186-7
Boehme, Jacob, 101-103
Bonchitté, on mysticism, 69
Bossuet, quoted, 220
Boston Post-Boy, on revival methods, 49
Bradley, on religion, 8
Brahmanism, 74-76
Brinton, on religion, 5, 6
— on racial insanity, 14
— on love and religion, 18
— on mysticism, 73-74
— quoted, 230
Browning, 117-119

Buddhism, a religion or philosophy? 175
Burnham, quoted, 194
Bustami, a Persian Sufi, 77

Caird, on religion, 11
Calvin, quoted, 214
— sketch of his life, 222-226
Carlyle, on symbolism, 139
— on doubt, 197-199
— on work, 204
— on religious institutions, 233
Castration, 30-32
Chauncy, on revivals, 49
Christian exegesis, 170-173
Christian Science, its forerunners and followers, 188-192

Christ The, a Russian mystical sect, 16, 29

Church organizations, 226-233
Clifford, on belief, 208
Clouston, on revivals, 48
Constant, on phallicism, 24
Conversion of Children, 56-58
Conversion, synchronous with development of sexual life, 20
Conway, quoted, 138
Cook, description of phallic rites, 25

Councils against use of medicines and Jewish physicians, 180, 183, 184

Cousin, on mysticism, 70

Criterion for determining what religions are pathological, 13

Davenport, an account of his preaching, 49

Definitions of religion, 5-12, 175

Definitions of religion, Criticism of, 8-9, 174

Dionysius, 83-84

Doubt, 193
— normal and abnormal doubt differentiated, 194-207

Eckart, Meister, 85-88

Edwards, Jonathan, his sermons, 34

Ellis, Havelock, on love and religion, 18
 Emerson, quoted, 77
 — his mysticism, 122-123
 Emotions cannot entirely account for religion, 174
 Empedocles, on religion, 5
 Erasmus on the monastic profession, 256
 Ewald, on mysticism, 70
 Fauatism, 215
 Farrar, quoted, 170
 Fear, an element in religious experience, 42-47
 — morbid fears, 45-46
 Feuerbach, on religion, 5, 8
 Fielding, account of his early religious training quoted, 205-6
 — on belief and conduct, 213
 Flagellants, described, 253-4
 Fox, George, 116-117
 Gematria, 161
 Gibbon, quoted, 256-7
 Goethe, on religion, 7
 — on mysticism, 70
 Grand Man, Swedenborg's description of, 109
 Guyau, on religion, 6
 Guyon, Mme., quoted, 16
 Hall, on religion and sex, 20
 — parallelisms between love and religion, 20-22
 — on pity, 39-40
 — on fear, 43-44
 — quoted, 209, 252
 Hammond, Rev., quoted, 57
 Harnack, on mysticism, 70
 — quoted, 255
 Hate, an element in religious experience, 33
 Heaven, Swedenborg's description of, 108
 Hegel, on religion, 7
 Hell, Swedenborg's description of, 113
 Herbart, on religion, 7
 Herodotus, on phallicism, 26
 Hershon, on the Talmud, 144ff
 Hetarism, 32
 Hierotheus, 82-83
 Hilton, Walter, 115
 Hobbes, on religion, 6
 Huxley, on belief, 208
 Inge, on mysticism, 70, 84
 Inoculation, opposition of Church leaders towards it, 185
 Intellect, its rôle in religion, 175
 Interpretation, 141ff
 Jains, 41-42
 James, Wm., on religion, 11
 — on St. Teresa, 16
 — on ritual worship, 138
 — on belief, 176, 202
 — on fanaticism, 216-217, 221
 — on individual and institutional religion, 227-228
 — on Henry Suso, 249-250
 Jennings, on love and religion, 18
 Jews as physicians, decrees of popes and councils against them, 183
 Judophobia, 183
 Julian of Norwich, 115
 Jumpers, 55
 Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, 176
 Kauchiluas The, their phallic rites, 29
 Kentucky Revival, 51-54
 Kidd, on rational religion, 175
 Kingsley, quoted, 126
 Knight, R. P., quoted, 135
 Kraft-Ebing, on religion and sex, 19
 Kropatkin, quoted, 40
 Lateau, Louise, a case of stigmatization, 41
 Lecky, quoted, 27, 35, 242-243, 246-247, 250, 257-258
 Lefèvre, André, quoted, 131
 Letourneau, on masculine hetarism, 32
 Leuba, definitions of religion classified, 7-8
 — quoted, 195, 196, 209, 210-212
 Lord, The, Swedenborg's description of, 110
 Love, an element in religious experience, 15
 Lucretius, on religion, 6
 Luther, on predestination, 37
 — on the writings of St. James, 174
 — on diseases, 184
 Mackay, quoted, 133
 Magic Christian, 182
 Magnus, Albertus, 84-85

Mahmud, quoted, 80
 Marie de l'Incarnation, her mystic experiences, 17
 Marshall, on religion, 8
 Martineau, on religion, 7
 Mill, on mysticism, 69
 Milton, quoted, 255
 Mishna, described, 141-142
 Monasticism, 233, 255-259
 Mooney, James, quoted, 125
 Mujerados, 31
 Murisier, quoted, 218-219, 222, 232
 Mysticism, 69-129
 — definitions of 69-70
 — protestant mysticism, 98ff
 — among primitive peoples, 123-125
 — mysticism analyzed, 125-129
 Mystics, criticised, 71-72
 Nietzsche, on pity, 39
 Noack, on mysticism, 70
 Nordau, on mysticism, 69
 Normality, criterion of 177
 Notrikon, 165-167
 Oldenfield, quoted, 58
 Ordure, use of, 182
 Other-worldists, four types of, 234-5
 Paracelsus, 100
 Parkman, quoted, 17
 Parsons, quoted, 50
 Pathological religion defined, 12
 Peccatophobia, 240
 Pfleiderer, on religion, 10
 — on mysticism, 70
 Phallicism, 22-30
 Philo, 81
 Pity, an element in religious experience, 38-42
 Plotinus, 81-82
 Praising wheels, 136-137
 Prayers, a remedy for disease, 179
 Prelibration, 29
 Prescott, quoted, 63-64
 Priapus, votaries of, 28
 Qabala, The, 160-170
 Quietists, 98
 Rabia, a Sufi saint, 77
 Reason, only one of the elements of religion, 174
 Récjac, on mysticism, 70
 Relics, 132-135, 179
 Religious suicides, 38
 Religious thieves, 38
 Renan, quoted, 201
 — on Calvin, 222-226
 Renunciation, 30
 Repetitions in prayers, 137-138
 Ritchie, on religion, 10
 Ritual worship, 138
 Romanes, on religion, 7
 Royal touch for diseases, 185
 Royce, on doubt, 200-201
 Rumi Jalaluddin, a Sufi poet, 77-78
 Russian Church, 140
 Russian Sects, 211
 Ruyssbroeck, quoted, 16
 — his mysticism, 91
 Sabatier, on asceticism, 251-252
 — on religion, 8
 Sacred wells and springs, 182
 — shrines, 182, 185
 Sacrifices, human, 59-65
 Said, quoted, 79
 Saints against the use of medicines and Jewish physicians, 178-183
 Schaff, quoted, 253
 Schleiermacher, on religion, 7
 Schroeder van den Kalk, on religion and sex, 19
 Schwenkfeld, 103
 Scientism, 207-9
 Sergi, on religion, 5
 Seth, on mysticism, 70
 Sex, relationship to religion, 15-33
 Shakers, 55
 Shelley, on religion, 6
 Signatures, doctrine of, 181
 Silesius, quoted, 126
 Simpson, Wm., quoted, 137
 Skoptsy, a Russian sect, 16, 32
 Spitzka, on religion and sex, 19
 Starbuck, quoted, 194-5
 Strabo, on phallicism, 27
 St. Augustine, on Roman licentiousness, 27
 St. Gertrude, her mystic experiences, 16-17
 St. Jerome, quoted, 34-35
 St. John of the Cross, 97-98
 — extract from his manual, 240-241
 St. Macarius of Alexandria, 245
 St. Paul, his mysticism, 80
 — on the law of righteousness, 174
 St. Peter Damiani, 248-249
 St. Rosalia, relics of, 179

St. Simeon Stylites, pictured
 — by Lecky, 243
 — by Baring-Gould, 246-7
St. Stephen of Grandmont, 248
St. Theodosius, 247-8
St. Theresa, 92-97
 — quoted, 257
Sufism, 76-80
Suso, James's extract from his
 autobiography, quoted, 249-250
Swedenborg, 105-114
Swedenborgianism criticised, 114-115
Symbolism, 130-134
Symbols, 132
Talmud, extracts from, 142-160
Taufer, 89-90
Temurah, 162
Tennyson 119-121, 202
Thugism, 36-37
Tolstoi, on religion, 11, 210-211

Tracy, quoted, 50
Tulloch, quoted, 226, 232
Tyler, quoted, 64

Upton, on religion, 8

Vaccination, Church leaders
 opposed to, 185-6
Vaughan, on mysticism, 69, 73, 76
Voltaire, on phallicism, 25
Von Hartmann, on mysticism, 70

Weigel, 103-104
Wellwood, quoted, 34
White, A. D., Warfare of Sci-
 ence with Theology, 178, 134
White, quoted, 114
Wier, on religion and sex, 20
Will, an element in the re-
 ligious experience, 213
Woodhouse, quoted, 257
Wordsworth, 121

Yogins, 76

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket

Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"

Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

